Encyclopedia Talmudit-Olah

Zadoq ben Aahron

אנציקלופדיה תלמודית:עולה

Encyclopedia Talmudit: Olah

Olah - an animal or bird offering that is entirely consumed by fire.

Table of Contents

1 Its essence, its type, and the commandment of its offering
1.1 The name rises
1.2 Holy of Holies
1.3 Issue
1.4 The ones practiced temporarily
1.5 Types of living creatures
1.6 The years
1.7 Male
1.8 Libations
1.9 The commandment of its making
1.10 Her virtue
2 its atonement
2.1 The sin that atones
2.2 The modes of atonement in a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment
2.3 Other prohibitions for which one does not receive lashes
2.4 Arrogance
2.5 Positive commandment that has with it a negative commandment
2.6 Intentional and Unintentional
2.7 Obligatory burnt offering
2.8 Atonement of the communal burnt offering
2.9 Obligation to Atone
2.10 How many transgressions
2.11 After the separation and after the slaughter
2.12 Atonement after the death of the owners
2.13 When he does not want or does not believe in the atonement of the burnt offering
2.14 When it was offered not for its sake
2.15 Doron is she
3 The volunteers ascend
3.1 Gentile
3.2 Apostate
3.3 After the death of the owners
3.4 The one who sells his burnt offering
3.5 Partnership

3.6 Public
4 Dedication and its services
4.1 Sanctification by mouth
4.2 For the need of his obligation or his vow
4.3 Semicha
4.4 Communal burnt offerings
4.5 Slaughtering and receiving in the north
4.6 The giving of its blood
4.7 Made below
4.8 Corresponding to the foundation
4.9 The remnants of the blood
4.10 The simplification and analysis
4.11 Placing the limbs on the table
4.12 Washing of the innards and legs
4.13 In seed
4.14 The order of the washing and the offering
4.15 The waters
4.16 The place of rinsing
4.17 The measure of rinsing
4.18 The manner of rinsing the entrails
4.19 The washing of the remaining flesh of the burnt offering
4.20 Her offering up
4.21 The law of sacrificial parts
4.22 Throwing when the flesh is lost
5 The law of its skin
5.1 The skin of the burnt offering
5.2 In the enumeration of the commandments
5.3 Burnt offering of converts, women, and slaves
5.4 Burnt offering of a non-Jew
5.5 That it has no owners
5.6 That which comes from the excess
5.7 Leaped with a throw
5.8 An offering that was disqualified
5.9 The blood is disqualified
5.10 The meat was disqualified before flaying
5.11 If the meat was lost or disqualified before the sprinkling
6 The trespass in it and the prohibition of its eating
6.1 Misuse in its skin
6.2 Misuse with bones
6.3 Misuse in the value of a burnt offering
6.4 The one who eats from its flesh
6.5 In the enumeration of the commandments
6.6 Combination to an olive's bulk
6.7 Not because it shall be entirely burnt it shall not be eaten
7 Footnotes

Its essence, its types, and the commandment of its offering

The burnt offering is from the four types of sacrifices - the general[1] - that come from living creatures, which are: burnt offering, sin offering*, guilt offering* and peace offerings*[2].

The Name Ascends

The burnt offering is called so because it is entirely offered to the fires[3], and it entirely ascends on the altar[4].

And there are those who explained that it is called thus, because it atones for the thought of the heart, according to those who hold thus[5], and it arises in the heart of a person[6].

And there are those who explained that since it atones for the transgression of neglecting a positive commandment* or of a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment*, according to those who hold thus[7], it is called a burnt offering[8].

And there are those who explained that it is called a burnt offering because it is the offering that continually ascends upon the altar, for indeed they offer the continual burnt offering* every morning and every evening[9].

And there are those who wrote that the purpose of offering the burnt offering is the advancement and elevation, and this is the meaning of its name[10].

Holy of Holies

The burnt offering is most holy*[11], and even though this is not explicitly stated in the Torah[12], since the scripture equates the burnt offering to the sin offering* and the guilt offering* - about which it is stated in the scripture that they are most holy[13] - regarding the place of its slaughter and the reception of its blood[14], we learn that it is most holy like them[15]. And there are those who wrote that since the burnt offering is entirely for the Most High[16], there is no greater most

holy than it, for even the portion of the Most High in lesser holy offerings* is called most holy[17], and all the more so the burnt offering which is entirely for the Most High[18].

Sugya

The burnt offering comes as an obligation, and comes as a vow and a donation[19]. Obligatory burnt offerings, some are communal burnt offerings and some are individual burnt offerings[20].

The public burnt offerings are: A) The continual offering* offered every day in the morning and between the evenings[21], B) The additional offerings offered on Sabbaths, festivals, and new moons[22], except for the goats of the festivals and new moons which are sin offerings[23], C) The lamb that comes with the omer* on the sixteenth of Nisan[24], D) The offerings that come with the two loaves* on the festival of Shavuot*, except for the two lambs of Atzeret* which are public peace offerings and the goat which is a sin offering*[25], E) The ram of the people* offered on Yom Kippur*, according to those who hold that this is not the ram included in the additional offering of Yom Kippur[26], F) The bull that comes with the goat for idolatry when the community errs in idolatry by the ruling of the court[27].

Burnt offerings of the individual are: A) Burnt offering of a woman after childbirth* [28], B) Burnt offering of a Nazirite*[29], C) Burnt offering of a leper*[30], D) Burnt offering of appearance*, offered at the pilgrimage festival on the festivals[31], not to appear before the Lord empty-handed[32], E) Ram of Aaron* which the High Priest* offers on Yom Kippur[33], F) Burnt offering which a convert* offers to complete his conversion[34].

On the zav* and the zavah* and the impure nazir*, and on the poor obligated in a variable offering* or the offering of a woman after childbirth or the offering of a leper, who offer a bird for an olah, see their valuations and see the bird offering.

On the convert who can bring for his conversion offering two birds for a burnt offering, see also conversion and see bird burnt offering.

The next offering in a freewill offering, comes in a freewill offering of an individual[35], and also comes in a freewill offering of the community, and it is the burnt offering of the altar’s summer*[36].

The practices for the time

Burnt offerings these are those that are practiced for generations, and besides them, there are burnt offerings that were practiced temporarily, and they are: a) The burnt offering of Sinai, which was offered close to the giving of the Torah, when Moses sent the young men of the children of Israel to offer burnt offerings and peace offerings on the altar he built under the mountain[37], some say they were offered before the giving of the Torah[38], and some say they were offered after it[39], and they were offered for all Israel[40], and through them, Israel entered the covenant[41], b) Burnt offerings that were offered for the consecration* at the establishment of the Tabernacle, some were offered during the seven days of consecration and some were offered on the eighth, some were communal burnt offerings, and some were the ram that Aaron brought on the eighth day, which is an individual burnt offering[42], c) Burnt offerings that the princes of Israel offered for the dedication of the Temple*, in the days following the establishment of the Tabernacle*[43], and they are individual burnt offerings[44], d) The bull burnt offering that the Levites offered on the day of their initiation into service[45], e) Burnt offerings that were offered on the day of the altar's establishment on Mount Ebal[46], after Israel's entry into the land[47].

On additional burnt offerings that were offered by temporary decree*, see also temporary decree: actions of prophets by temporary decree.

Types of Living Creatures

The burnt offering comes from all five types of animals from which the sacrifices come, three types of cattle: cattle, sheep, goats, and two types of birds: turtledoves, pigeons[48].

This entry deals with the specific laws of a burnt offering that comes from types of cattle, for the specific laws of a burnt offering that comes from types of birds see also bird burnt offering.

Obligatory burnt offerings, sometimes their law is to come from certain animals, and on this see the entries of the different burnt offering sacrifices.

The Years

The burnt offering comes from an animal whether within its year or after its year[49].

Burnt offerings that come as an obligation sometimes their law is to come specifically from an animal within its year, or from an animal after its year, or from an animal from its third year, and on this see the values of the different burnt offerings.

Male

The burnt offering of an animal comes only from the males[50], as it is said: male[51], and not female[52], male[53], and not a tumtum or androgynous[54].

On the exchange of a burnt offering, see Temurah.

Libations

The burnt offering, whether an obligatory individual burnt offering or a voluntary individual burnt offering or a communal burnt offering, requires libations*[55], for any offering that has a counterpart that comes as a vow and a voluntary offering - such as a burnt offering[56] - even when it comes as an obligation, it requires libations[57].

And so the burnt offering of the summer of the altar*, which is a communal freewill burnt offering[58], requires libations, and its libations are offered from the communal funds[59]. On the libations and their appropriate measure for each offering, see also libations.

On the lamb of the burnt offering that comes with the omer*, which requires a meal offering of libations* double that of other lambs, and in any case, its wine libations are like those of other lambs, see above the aforementioned and see omer.

On the offering of the libations, see also the meal offering of libations and see libations.

The commandment of its making

The making of the burnt offering according to its ordinance written in the Torah is a positive commandment*[60], as it is said: “When a man among you brings an offering, etc., if his offering is a burnt offering”[61], and it is counted in the

enumeration of the commandments*[62].

And even though several commandments are stated in the Torah, for each detail of the performance of the burnt offering[63], early authorities wrote that they are all counted as one commandment[64].

And included in this commandment are both the act of the individual burnt offering and the act of the communal burnt offering[65], and also included in this commandment are both the burnt offering of an animal and the burnt offering of a bird*[66].

And all the acts of the burnt offering are included in the commandment, whether its slaughtering, flaying, and dismembering - which are valid by a non-priest*[67] - and whether its other services - which are performed by priests[68] - and likewise included in this commandment is the offering of the meal offering of the libations and the pouring of the wine libations that come with the animal burnt offering[69], and the giving of the skin of the animal burnt offering to the priests[70].

And there are those who count each of the acts of the sacrifices - and the burnt offering among them - as a separate commandment: slaughtering*, pinching*, receiving*, sprinkling* - and throwing* among them[71] - and burning*[72].

And there are those who count the offering of a burnt offering of cattle, a burnt offering of sheep, and a burnt offering of birds, as three separate commandments[73].

The commandment of the act of the burnt offering was written by the early authorities that it is counted apart from the commandments that obligate the bringing of each obligatory burnt offering[74] - on these commandments see Zebahim: his offering, and see Zavah: her offering, and see Yoledet: her offering, and see Metzora, and see Nazir, and see Nazir Tamei, and see the variable offering, and see the burnt offering of appearance, and see the Tamid, and see the additional offering, and see the Omer, and see the two loaves, and see the service of Yom Kippur, and see the goats of idolatry - and there are those who explained in their opinion that since the commandment of making the burnt offering is imposed on the priests[75], they count it separately from the commandments of the obligation to bring obligatory burnt offerings which are imposed on the bringers[76].

And there are early authorities who disagree and hold that the commandment of performing each burnt offering is included in the commandment of its obligation to bring it - and even a freewill burnt offering, its commandment of performance is included in the commandment of fulfilling the vow and the freewill offering[77] - and it is not counted on its own, but besides this, they count according to their

opinion a commandment upon the priests to perform the acts of all the sacrifices, as it is said: “And you shall serve as a gift service I give your priesthood”[78], and included in that commandment is also that the priests shall perform the act of the burnt offering[79].

The commandment of performing the burnt offering, according to those who hold it is a commandment in itself, early authorities wrote that it is incumbent upon the priests, and a priest who deviated from the order of the act of the burnt offering nullified this commandment[80].

On those who consider the giving of the skin of the burnt offering - and other skins of the holy offerings - to the priests as counted as a separate commandment, see also priestly gifts.

On the blessing of the commandments* that are blessed in the doing of the burnt offering - and other sacrifices - see sacrifices.

Its Virtue

The burnt offering, since it is entirely [81], is beloved more than other sacrifices [82].

Therefore, it is called a burnt offering, for it is superior to all the sacrifices[83], as a sin offering* or a guilt offering* or a meal offering, the priest takes them[84], and the peace offering* is for the owners[85], but the burnt offering no creature tastes from it and it is entirely for the Holy One, blessed be He[86].

And all the offerings come for sin, and the burnt offering does not come for sin and iniquity[87], therefore it is at the head of the offerings[88].

And the burnt offering is called “sacrifices of righteousness”[89], for it does not come for sin[90], and Zion and Jerusalem are built only by the merit of the burnt offering that Israel would offer, as it is said: Do good in Your favor to Zion, build the walls of Jerusalem, then You will desire sacrifices of righteousness, burnt offering and whole offering[91].

Its Atonement

The burnt offering, even though it comes by vow and by freewill offering[92], its offering atones[93], as it is said about it: and it shall be accepted for him[94], teaching that the Omnipresent accepts him[95].

Atonement of the burnt offering for the transgressions it atones for, there are early authorities who wrote that it is an atonement of “kib’a”[96] - meaning a fixed atonement[97], and completely[98] - and there are early authorities who wrote that the atonement of the burnt offering for the transgressions it atones for is an atonement of “kofya”[99] - meaning a floating atonement[100], and not completely[101] - for the burnt offering is a gift[102].

The sin that atones

In the Torah of the Priests, it is taught, it does not atone for those liable to death by the court* or liable to excision* or liable to death by the hands of heaven* or liable to lashes* or liable to sin-offerings* or liable to guilt-offerings*, for their punishment is stated - and even those liable to death by the court or death by the hands of heaven or lashes inadvertently, for whom no punishment is stated, since death and lashes are only for intentional [103], they are not atoned by the burnt offering, for the language of appeasement stated in the burnt offering seems to be atonement for intentional and not for inadvertent [104], or those whose punishment is stated for intentional and not for inadvertent, we learn that they have only their punishment in intentional, and in inadvertent they do not need appeasement [105], or since we do not find that inadvertence in these transgressions is called sin, it cannot be said that appeasement would be upon it [106], or the language of appeasement indicates the return of love, and it is more than atonement which means only the removal of hatred, therefore it should be explained that appeasement comes for those whose punishment is not stated even in intentional and not for those whose punishment is stated in intentional [107] - but those liable to positive commandments, and those liable to a negative commandment that is rectified by a positive commandment* - who do not receive lashes [108] - whose punishment is not stated, the burnt offering atones for them [109].

And so said Rabbi Ishmael in Tanchuma, that a burnt offering atones for positive commandments and for negative commandments[110], and that is a negative commandment that is rectified by a positive commandment[111], and so said Rabbi Akiva in the Tosefta[112], and even Rabbi Yose the Galilean who says in the Tosefta that a burnt offering atones for the sin of gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and corners*[113], the early commentators explained his reasoning because there is in them a negative commandment rectified by a positive commandment[114], and it is the same that it atones for other negative commandments rectified by a positive commandment according to his opinion[115].

R' Shimon bar Yochai says, a burnt offering atones only for the thought of the heart[116], as it is said in Job: and he would offer burnt offerings according to the number of them all, for Job said, perhaps my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts[117], and R' Levi said, it is a full verse: and that which comes into your mind shall not be at all[118].

And from the early ones, there are those who wrote, that according to its simple meaning, a burnt offering atones for a sin when it is not known at all, such as one who eats forbidden fat* - for which there is a sin offering* in error and a suspensive guilt offering* in doubt[119] - and he thought he ate permissible[120].

To the law, early authorities wrote that a burnt offering atones for a positive commandment and a negative commandment that is rectified by a positive commandment[121].

Modes of Atonement in a Prohibition that is Transformed into a Positive Commandment

Atonement of a burnt offering for a negative commandment that is rectified by a positive commandment* appears in the Talmud to also be in a manner where he did not fulfill the positive commandment, as long as he is not liable for lashes for the negative commandment[122].

Transgressed a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment in a manner that incurs lashes - and that is when he actively nullified the possibility of fulfilling the positive commandment, according to those who hold so[123], or when the possibility of fulfilling the positive commandment was nullified on its own, according to those who hold so[124], or when he was able to fulfill the positive commandment and did not fulfill it, according to those who hold so[125] - an offering does not atone for him[126].

Transgressed a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment and has not yet incurred lashes, but it is possible that he will incur lashes in the future - by nullifying the positive commandment - the later authorities disagreed: some say that the offering atones for him[127], and some say it does not atone[128].

Transgressed a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment and corrected the prohibition by fulfilling the positive commandment, there are later authorities from whose words it appears that he does not need atonement of an olah[129], and there are later authorities who wrote that he is atoned by an olah[130].

Other Negative Commandments for Which One Does Not Receive Lashes

A prohibition-in-general* and a prohibition-without-an-act*, for which one does not receive lashes, according to those who hold so[131], even though the punishment for transgressing them is not stated - and we have learned that a burnt offering atones for transgressions whose punishment is not stated, according to those who hold so[132] - early authorities wrote that a burnt offering does not atone for them[133], because from the verse “and it shall be accepted for him”[134] - from which we learned that a burnt offering atones[135] - we learned that the burnt offering specifically atones for something that has a remedy and appeasement in another manner, such as a positive commandment* or a prohibition-that-is-corrected-by-a-positive-commandment*[136], for if one nullified the positive commandment of sukkah or tefillin for a day or two, he can return and fulfill them, and similarly if he transgressed a prohibition that is corrected by a positive commandment, he has a remedy by fulfilling the positive commandment - and for the same reason, a burnt offering was made to atone for those liable to death or lashes if not for their punishment being stated[137], for they have a remedy and appeasement in another manner, by fulfilling the punishment[138] - but a prohibition-in-general and a prohibition-without-an-act, for which we have not found another remedy, a burnt offering does not atone for them[139].

And from the later ones, there are those whose words seem to indicate that all the prohibitions for which one does not receive lashes, and that is a general prohibition and a prohibition without an action, and likewise a prohibition derived from a positive commandment*[140], and a prohibition that can be compensated*[141] - provided that he paid[142] - the burnt offering atones for them[143].

Arrogance

Arrogance, there are some of the latter ones who wrote based on a Midrash, that it ascends atonement upon it[144].

Positive Commandment that is Accompanied by a Negative Commandment

The transgressor of a positive commandment* that has with it a negative commandment*, in a manner that he is liable to lashes for the transgression of the negative commandment - that an olah does not atone for the negative commandment[145] - it appears in the Talmud that he is not atoned by an olah for the transgression of the positive commandment that comes with the negative commandment[146].

Intentional and Unintentional

Transgressions that the burnt offering atones for, it atones for them even when done intentionally[147].

Transgressed those transgressions unintentionally, among the early authorities there are those whose words suggest that his atonement is not with a burnt offering[148], and there are early authorities who wrote that a burnt offering atones for those transgressions whether he transgressed them intentionally or whether he transgressed unintentionally[149].

Obligatory Burnt Offering

Even one who brings a mandatory burnt offering - such as a woman after childbirth[150] - his burnt offering atones for the transgressions in his hand that a burnt offering atones for them[151].

Atonement of the Public Burnt Offering

Public burnt offerings - such as additional offerings[152] - they too atone[153], and their atonement is for positive commandments, like individual burnt offerings[154]. And among the latter ones, there are those who inclined that the additional offerings of the Sabbath do not atone[155].

Obligation to Atone

Even those for whom the burnt offering atones, are not obligated to bring a burnt offering for their atonement, but if they brought, it atoned for them[156].

How many transgressions

Even if he committed several transgressions for which a burnt offering atones and he brought a burnt offering, the burnt offering atones for all of them[157], for the scripture did not obligate him to bring a burnt offering for his atonement[158], to obligate him for each transgression individually, but the offering of the burnt offering is only as a gift[159], and from the scripture “and it shall be accepted for him”[160] - from which we learned that the burnt offering appeases[161] - we learned that he is appeased to the Holy One, blessed be He, by the offering of the burnt offering from all those transgressions for which a burnt offering atones[162], thus all of them are atoned[163].

After the separation and after slaughter

The transgressions that the burnt offering atones for[164], it was questioned in the Talmud whether they are specifically when a person sinned with them before the designation of the burnt offering - like the sin offering*, which only atones for a sin that preceded its designation[165] - or also when a person sinned with them after the designation of the burnt offering, before it was offered[166] - since the sin offering only atones for one sin[167], but the burnt offering atones for several transgressions[168], and therefore it is possible that it also atones for those committed after its designation[169] - and even if the burnt offering atones for transgressions after its designation, it was questioned in the Talmud whether it is specifically for those committed before its slaughter, or also for transgressions that a person committed after the slaughter of the burnt offering, before the sprinkling*, the burnt offering atones for them[170].

To the opinion of R' Zeira, it was said in the Talmud that the burnt offering atones also for transgressions after its slaughter, before the sprinkling, and all the more so it atones for those after the designation before the slaughter[171].

And the opinion of Rava is that certainly the burnt offering does not atone for transgressions after its slaughter, and there is doubt only regarding transgressions after its designation before the slaughter[172].

And from the early ones, there are those who inclined that the doubt regarding transgressions after the designation - before the slaughter - is resolved, and the offering atones for transgressions committed after its designation[173].

Transgressions that a person sinned after he became obligated - due to obligation or due to vow[174] - to bring a burnt offering, and before he set it aside, according to everyone, the burnt offering he brings atones for them[175], because since the atonement of those transgressions that a burnt offering atones for does not obligate him to bring a burnt offering[176], his setting it aside is effective so that the burnt offering atones for all the transgressions he did beforehand, even if he was already obligated in a burnt offering[177].

Atonement after the Death of the Owners

The burnt offering sacrificed after the death of its owners[178], it appears in the Talmud that it does not atone for the owners who died[179].

And there are early authorities from whose words it appears that a burnt offering sacrificed after the death of its owners atones for them for those transgressions for which a burnt offering atones[180], and what they said that there is no atonement for the dead* does not apply to a burnt offering, as it does not come for the atonement of a known sin[181].

And there are early authorities who wrote that the dispute of the Amoraim is regarding an olah offering that was sacrificed after the death of its owners, whether it atones for them for those transgressions that an olah atones for[182].

On the atonement of an heir* in the burnt offering that he brings for the obligation of his bequeather, see also heir (1): in the sacrifices of the bequeather[183].

When he does not want or does not believe in the atonement of the burnt offering

The one who says, “I do not want the burnt offering to atone for me,” it is said in the Jerusalem Talmud that it does not atone for him against his will[184], for he does not want it to atone for him, and he rejects its atonement[185]. And it is stated regarding the burnt offering: “according to his will”[186], and anyone who does not want its atonement, it is against his will and it does not atone[187]. But the one who says, “The burnt offering does not atone,” or “The burnt offering

does not atone for me," the burnt offering does atone for him[188], for he is merely mistaken and thinks that it does not atone[189], and it is according to his will, for if he knew that it atones, he would want its atonement[190].

And there are those who wrote - according to their version in the Jerusalem Talmud - that it is a dispute among the Amoraim between one who says a burnt offering does not atone or a burnt offering does not atone for me and one who says I do not want it to atone for me[191], some hold that it does not atone[192], because one who says so rejects the atonement of the burnt offering and it cannot atone for him[193], or because since he brings the burnt offering of his own accord - which he is not obligated in[194] - and does not want its atonement, it does not atone against his will[195], and some hold that it does atone[196], because since in the end he brought a burnt offering, he has shown that he desires it to atone for him[197].

When it was offered not for its sake

An offering that was sacrificed not for its sake, which is valid but does not fulfill the obligation for its owners[198], early authorities wrote that it does not atone for its owners for those transgressions that the offering atones for[199].

Doron is

The burnt offering - even though it atones[200] - comes only as a gift, for before the sinner repents it cannot come for his atonement, for the sacrifice of the wicked* is an abomination[201], and once he has repented he is already atoned, for one who transgresses a positive commandment* and repents does not move from there until he is forgiven[202] - and the atonement of the burnt offering is for a positive commandment[203] - rather it is a gift[204], for it does not come to atone truly, but after repentance has atoned it comes for a reception, like a person who offended a king and appeased him through advocates and when he comes to greet him brings a gift in his hand[205].

And the early ones wrote that there is no wonder that a burnt offering is needed to atone for what has already been atoned for by repentance, for there is no obligation to bring it for the transgressions it atones for[206], and even after repentance, it is not completely forgiven, and the burnt offering helps to be completely atoned[207].

And from the later ones, there are those who wrote, that after repentance has succeeded in transforming intentional sins into unintentional ones, the atonement of the burnt offering succeeds in transforming them into merits[208].

And there are early authorities who wrote that a burnt offering is called a gift because it does not atone for a known sin like a sin offering and a guilt offering[209].

The Volunteers Ascend

The burnt offering that comes as a freewill offering, comes both from the freewill offering of a man and from the freewill offering of a woman, and also from the freewill offering of a slave[210], and from the freewill offering of a convert or a female convert[211], as it is said: Any man of the house of Israel or of the strangers in Israel who offers his offering etc. as a burnt offering[212], “Israel” these are Israelites, “stranger” these are the converts, “the stranger” to include the wives of the converts, “in Israel” to include women and slaves[213].

Gentile

The burnt offering comes from the donation of a gentile[214], as it is said: any man[215], to include the gentiles who vow and donate like Israelites[216], and it is said there: which they will offer to the Lord for a burnt offering[217].

On those who hold that Gentiles offer only a burnt offering, or that even peace offerings which they offer are treated as a burnt offering, see also Gentile[218].

Apostate

Olah - even though it is a gift and does not come to atone for sin[219] - it is not accepted from the apostate*[220] - even though an olah is accepted from the nations[221] - as it is said: Speak to the children of Israel, etc., a man who brings from you[222] - and not all of you[223] - to exclude the apostates[224], for they have broken the covenant, and their deeds are not like the children of Israel who bring offerings, who are members of the covenant[225], and so it says: The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination[226].

Apostate, that we do not accept from him an offering, this is the apostate to the entire Torah, and likewise the apostate to idolatry* or to desecrate Sabbaths publicly, who is like an apostate to the entire Torah, according to those who hold so and the law is like them[227], but the apostate to one thing we accept from him an offering, as it is said: from the animal[228], to include people who are similar to animals - who do not observe the commandments[229] - from here they said, we accept offerings from the sinners of Israel so that they may repent[230].

The apostate for one transgression that a burnt offering atones for it[231], and brings a burnt offering for the atonement of that transgression, it appears from the words of the early authorities that they accept from him – and his judgment is not like an apostate for a transgression that requires a sin offering, from whom they do not accept a sin offering for the atonement of that transgression[232] - for the burnt offering is a voluntary offering and comes as a gift[233].

And from the later ones, there are those who wrote in the opinion of the earlier ones that the apostate for one transgression is not accepted from him a burnt offering for the atonement of that transgression[234].

A heretic to idolatry from whom we do not accept an offering, this is when he is an Israelite, but a gentile who practices idolatry we do accept from him[235], as it is said: “from you,” among you I have differentiated, and not among the nations[236], and the offering of gentiles is not to be said of it “the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination,” for only an Israelite who has accepted the commandments and transgresses them is called wicked, but gentiles even when they transgress the commandments are not called wicked, since they have not accepted them upon themselves[237], and even a completely wicked gentile we accept from him to bring him under the wings of the Divine Presence[238].

A proselyte apostate, we do not accept an offering from him[239], and there are among the latter ones who wrote that we accept an offering from a proselyte apostate[240].

After the death of owners

The burnt offering, whether a voluntary burnt offering or an obligatory burnt offering, is offered even after the death of its owner[241]. On the obligation of the heir to bring the burnt offering of his bequeather, see Inheritance (A): in the offerings of the bequeather.

The one who sells his burnt offering

The one who sells his burnt offering, has done nothing[242], and only the first owner is atoned by it[243], and it must be offered for his sake[244]. Regarding the money received by the seller for himself sacrifices.

Partnership

The burnt offering, besides that it comes as a freewill offering of an individual[245], it comes as a freewill offering of two[246] - or more than two[247] - and also comes as a vow of two[248], as it is said: you shall offer[249], Rabbi says, all the holy offerings - except for meal offerings*[250] - come in partnership, as it is said: which they shall offer their offering for all their vows and for all their freewill offerings which they shall offer to the Lord for a burnt offering[251].

A mandatory individual burnt offering, does not come in partnership[252], for indeed each individual is obligated by himself, and how can two be exempted with one offering[253].

On the burnt-offering of appearance*, which is a mandatory burnt-offering[254], that some hold it comes in partnership, see there.

Public

The burnt offering, besides that it comes as a freewill offering of an individual[255], it comes as a freewill offering of the community*[256], as it is said: your offering[257], and some interpret: your offering[258], from the place where the individual brings it - and that is as a freewill offering[259] - from there the community brings[260].

The burnt offerings that come as a public donation are the burnt offerings that come from the surplus*, according to those who hold this view[261], which are offered for the maintenance of the altar*[262]. Similarly, if the public wishes to initially designate a burnt offering as a donation, and they collect it from the majority of Israel just as they collect the shekels*, some of the early authorities wrote that the burnt offering is considered a public donation[263]. Others wrote, in the opinion of early authorities, that only the burnt offering that comes from the surplus is considered a public burnt offering, since it is offered by the condition of the court, as the court stipulates* regarding the surplus that they be

offered for the maintenance of the altar[264]. However, burnt offerings that the public initially donates - even if they collected them from all of Israel[265] - are not a public donation but a donation of partners[266]. Some wrote that from the verse “your offering” they derived to include that the public collects and designates a burnt offering as a donation initially, besides bringing a burnt offering from the surplus. In any case, this burnt offering is not offered as a public burnt offering, but they give it to one of them, and he offers it as an individual burnt offering[267].

On coercion and collateral of those obligated to bring an olah offering, see also those obligated in offerings[268].

The Dedication and Its Services

Sanctification by Mouth

An animal does not become a burnt offering except when it is consecrated for that purpose[269], and that is verbally[270], as it is said: an offering to the Lord[271], that its consecration should precede its sacrifice[272], and even though it is possible to bring it to the Temple courtyard while still non-sacred and consecrate it afterward, and thus Hillel would do with his burnt offering so that they would not misuse it, according to those who hold this view[273], nevertheless, the consecration must precede its laying on of hands[274].

On the consecration, and if it applies in thought, see consecration.

For the purpose of his obligation or his vow

One who sets aside an animal for the purpose of his obligatory burnt offering - such as when his wife gave birth and he consecrates an animal for the burnt offering of a woman after childbirth* which she is obligated in[275] - he must say this is for my obligatory burnt offering[276], and likewise one who sets aside for the purpose of his vow burnt offering, he says this is for my vow[277].

Ordination

All individual burnt offerings require laying on of hands*[278], as it is said regarding a voluntary burnt offering of cattle: And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering[279], since it is said “the burnt offering” - and this

word is superfluous, for the scripture is dealing with a burnt offering sacrifice, and it should have said "upon its head[280] - it is expounded in the Torat Kohanim to include for laying on of hands all individual burnt offerings, whether a voluntary burnt offering or an obligatory burnt offering, whether a burnt offering of cattle or a burnt offering of sheep[281].

And in the Talmud we have learned, it is said regarding the burnt offering of the eighth day of the inauguration*: and he did according to the ordinance[282], like the ordinance of a freewill burnt offering - for all the ordinances of a burnt offering are stated in the section of the freewill burnt offering[283] - it taught about a mandatory burnt offering that it requires laying on of hands[284].

And from the early ones, there are those who wrote that laying hands on a sheep burnt offering does not require an amplification, as it is stated in the sheep burnt offering: And if from the sheep[285], and a vav adds to the first matter[286] - and this is the section of the cattle burnt offering that was written before it[287] - and we learn the lower from the upper[288].

On the laying on of hands, and that it does not impede the offering, see there. On the confession* at the time of laying on of hands, see there[289]. On the necessity that the slaughtering of the offering be done immediately after the laying on of hands, see there Slaughtering (Kodashim).

On a burnt offering made on a high place, which does not require laying on of hands, see high place[290]. On the burnt offering of women and gentiles, which does not require laying on of hands, see laying on of hands.

Communal Burnt Offerings

Public burnt offerings do not require laying on of hands*[291], for it is a law given to Moses at Sinai* that all communal offerings - except for two[292] - do not have laying on of hands[293].

Slaughtering and Receiving in the North

The slaughtering of the burnt offering is done in the north[294] - like other most holy offerings*[295] - as it is said regarding a sheep burnt offering that comes as a freewill offering: and he shall slaughter it on the side of the altar northward[296], and also a cattle burnt offering is the same, as it is said regarding a sheep burnt offering: and if it be of the sheep[297], and the

conjunction “and” adds to the first matter[298] - and this is the section of the cattle burnt offering that was written before it[299] - and we learn the upper from the lower[300].

And even the obligatory burnt offering, its slaughtering is in the north, as it is said regarding the sin offering: in the place where the burnt offering is slaughtered, the sin offering shall be slaughtered[301] - this comes to teach and is found to be learned*[302] - from here for the obligatory burnt offering that its slaughtering should only be in the north[303], since the scripture deals with a sin offering which is obligatory - for a sin offering does not come as a voluntary offering[304] - even the burnt offering mentioned in it is an obligatory burnt offering, and we have learned that it requires the north[305].

And even the communal burnt offering, its slaughtering is in the north, as it is said regarding the guilt offering: in the place where they slaughter the burnt offering, they shall slaughter the guilt offering[306], from here for the communal burnt offering that its slaughtering should only be in the north[307].

And so the receiving of the blood of the burnt offering is done in the north[308] - like other most holy offerings[309] - and even the one who receives the blood needs to be standing in the north[310].

And the early commentators explained that since it is said regarding the sin offering of a prince: “And he shall slaughter it in the place where they slaughter the burnt offering, etc., and the priest shall take from the blood of the sin offering”[311], and they derived from this that the receiving of the blood of the sin offering should be in the place of the slaughtering of the burnt offering, which is in the north, and the receiver should stand in the place of the slaughtering of the burnt offering, which is in the north[312], thus from this it can be learned that even the place of receiving and the receiver in the burnt offering is in the place of its slaughtering, which is in the north[313].

And there are those who explained that the receiving of the blood of the burnt offering in the north is learned from the verse stated regarding the burnt offering of cattle: “And he shall slaughter the young bull before the Lord, and Aaron’s sons, the priests, shall bring the blood”[314], for “before the Lord” stated here in the slaughtering means in the north, as they learned the upper from the lower[315], and again it is to be learned that also “and they shall bring,” which is the receiving of the blood[316], shall be in the place of the slaughtering, which is in the north[317].

On the boundaries of the north and the slaughtering and the receiving therein, and on slaughtering and receiving on the top of the altar if they are considered as slaughtering and receiving in the north, see also Holy of Holies. On the

slaughtering and receiving in the north that are indispensable, see also the aforementioned.

On an olah offering made on a bamah*, which does not require the north, see bamah[318]. On the place of slaughter of the daily olah offering, see tamid. On one who slaughters kodshei kodashim in the south, if he transgresses a prohibition, see kodshei kodashim.

The Giving of Her Blood

Giving the blood of the burnt offering to the altar is in two applications that are four[319].

In the original law, and also in its definition, the Tannaim disagreed: The first Tanna says, it is stated: and they shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about[320], one might think with one sprinkling, the text teaches to say: round about, one might think he should encircle it like a thread, the text teaches to say: and they shall sprinkle - and it is impossible to encircle like a thread except with a finger and by touching, and not by sprinkling which is done from afar[321] - rather two applications which are four[322], that he places on two corners standing diagonally from each other[323], and like a gamma[324] - a Greek letter made like a simple kaf[325] - that he sprinkles towards the corner and the blood spreads to two sides of the corner[326], and it turns out that the blood reached around the altar from all its sides and by sprinkling[327].

R' Yishmael says, it is stated here: around[328], and it is stated regarding the sin offering of the inauguration*: and he put it on the horns of the altar around[329], just as there it is interrupted by four applications - that the application of the blood of the sin offering is in four applications on four horns[330] - so too here it is interrupted by four applications[331], one might think just as there on four horns so too here on four horns, if you say so it turns out that he also gives on the southeastern horn, which does not have a base[332], and the application of the blood of the burnt offering needs to be done opposite the base of the altar[333], rather four applications on two horns[334], and he gives and returns and gives[335], that he gives on two horns standing diagonally from each other, and on each of them he throws from the vessel to this side of the horn and also to the other side, and it turns out that he gave the blood to the four sides of the altar, one application for each side[336].

Halacha that two gifts like a gamma he gives[337]. On the details of giving two gifts that are four, and if they prevent, see also sprinkling[338].

On those who hold that the daily burnt offering* has a different form of blood application than other burnt offerings, see above[339] and see Tamid.

Made below

The burnt offering is done below[340], and that is that its blood is sprinkled from the half of the altar and below[341], under the red line that girds the middle of the altar[342].

In the reason that the sprinkling of the burnt offering is done below, the early authorities wrote, it is stated regarding it “altar”[343], and it is not stated regarding it “horns” - as it is stated in the outer sin offerings*[344] - to say that it is done above[345], and it cannot be said that the entire altar is its place, for the Torah gave a partition - of the scarlet thread - to distinguish between upper and lower bloods[346], it is found that its place is only below[347].

And there are those who say that the place of the burnt offering is below because the burnt offering requires a foundation[348], and below on the altar is the place of the foundation[349].

And there are those who seem from their words an additional reason, that just as we find in the bird offerings, that the bird sin-offering* is done below[350], and the bird burnt-offering* opposite to it, and is done above[351], so in animal offerings, since the sin-offering is done above[352], the burnt-offering opposite to it and is done below[353].

And from the later ones there are those who wrote, that since it is said in the giving of the blood of the burnt offering “and they shall sprinkle”[354] - and sprinkling is only from afar[355] - it is impossible for it to be done by one standing above on the surrounding, as his standing is near the altar, but rather by one standing below on the ground, and it turns out the blood is given below[356].

And furthermore, we find in the Talmud according to the Tannaim, that it is a derivation regarding the sin offering about which it is said: the priest who offers it as a sin offering[357], its blood is above and not the blood of another above[358], and the Rishonim wrote that from this derivation it can be learned that even the burnt offering’s blood is only placed below[359].

Corresponding to the Foundation

The burnt offering requires a foundation[360], that its blood gifts be on the altar opposite the foundation[361], that the blood be placed where there is a foundation below it[362], and that is not on the southeastern corner, which does not have a foundation beneath it[363], but rather on those corners that have a foundation beneath them[364].

Some say that they expounded thus from what is said regarding the goat of the prince: “And its blood shall be poured at the base of the altar of burnt offering”[365] - and “the burnt offering” is superfluous for exposition[366] - give a base to the altar of burnt offering[367], and this is - according to their opinion - that the blood applications should be opposite the base[368], and one should not learn from this exposition that the blood applications of the burnt offering should be given to the height of the base itself, for the matter is a fortiori*, that if the blood remnants* of the sin offering, which are given to the base[369], and do not impede the atonement[370], are not given to the height of the base but on the roof of the base[371], all the more so the initial blood of the burnt offering, which impedes the atonement[372], is not given to the height of the base but on the roof of the base[373], and since it is stated in the verse “the base of the altar of burnt offering” and not “the base of the burnt offering”, we learn that the initial blood of the burnt offering is not given to the roof of the base itself, like the blood remnants[374], but to the height of the altar above the base[375].

And there are those who say that the very law of the sprinkling of the blood of the burnt offering on the altar opposite the foundation is derived a fortiori from the remnants of the blood of the sin offering, which do not impede the atonement, and are placed on the roof of the foundation, and all the more so the beginning of the blood of the burnt offering, which impedes the atonement, that it is placed on the altar above the foundation[376], but it is not placed on the roof of the foundation itself like the remnants of the blood, because in order to fulfill with the blood two applications that are four, as the law of the beginning blood of the burnt offering[377], it is preferable to perform the sprinkling on the elevation of the altar above the foundation[378].

And there are those who say that they learned the beginning of the blood of the burnt offering opposite the foundation by a fortiori reasoning from the remnants of the blood of the burnt offering itself, which do not impede the atonement, and are placed on the foundation[379], and all the more so the beginning of the blood of the burnt offering which impedes the atonement, that it requires a foundation[380].

Even the second gift from the two gifts of the blood of the burnt offering - which does not impede the atonement[381] - requires a base[382], for regarding both gifts as one it is said: and they shall sprinkle[383], and therefore they are learned from one another, and just as the one gift requires a base, so too the other gift requires a base[384].

The Remainders of the Blood

Songs-of-the-blood* of the burnt offering, are poured below[385], to the base of the altar[386].

There are those who say that they expounded thus from what is stated regarding the goat of the prince: “And its blood shall be poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering”[387] - and “the burnt offering” mentioned here is superfluous for exposition[388] - provide a base for the altar of burnt offering[389], and this is - according to their opinion - that the altar requires the pouring of the remnants at the base[390], and among them there are those who wrote, that even though from this exposition they learned - according to their opinion - for the initial blood of the burnt offering to be placed opposite the base[391], nevertheless from the word “altar”, which is superfluous, they learned that the remnants of the blood of the burnt offering are also placed at the base[392].

We also find that they expounded, it is said: And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured, etc.[393], we learned that all the bloods require the placing of blood on the foundation[394], and even though “foundation” is not mentioned in the text, since we find with the remnants of the blood of the sin offering that they are placed on the foundation[395], so too the remnants of other bloods[396].

Rabbi says, it is stated in the sin offering of the bird: and the remainder of the blood shall be drained[397] - and the word “of the blood” is superfluous[398] - it taught about all the bloods that require the application of blood to the foundation[399].

And there are early authorities who hold that for the burnt offering - except for the continual burnt offering[400] - there is no pouring of the remnants to the foundation[401].

Pouring of the remnants in the burnt offering, there are early authorities who wrote that it applies only when the entire blood was not sprinkled in the two applications at the beginning of the burnt offering[402], but the one who sprinkles is permitted to sprinkle the entire blood in the two applications and will no longer need the pouring of remnants[403].

And there are early authorities who disagree, that the pouring of the remnants to the foundation is required in a burnt offering, and one must be careful in the sprinkling that some of the blood remains for the pouring of the remnants[404].

The pouring of the remnants of the blood of the burnt offering is done at the southern base[405], at the southwestern corner of the altar the priest completes the gifts of the blood of the burnt offering[406], and the pouring of the remnants is done near it[407].

On the boundaries of pouring the remnants to the foundation, see also the remnants of the blood.

On the rest of their laws of the four services* of the offering: slaughtering*, receiving*, carrying*, sprinkling*, see their values. On that they need to be done during the day, see also day and see offerings.

On things that need to be done for their sake the works of the burnt offering and on the thoughts that invalidate in sacrifices, see also thought in sanctities.

The Simple Meaning and Analysis

The burnt offering requires flaying and dismembering*[408], as it is stated regarding the voluntary burnt offering of cattle: And he shall flay the burnt offering and cut it into its pieces[409], and so too the burnt offering of sheep and the obligatory burnt offering, as it is stated: the burnt offering - and it is superfluous for interpretation, as the text is dealing with the burnt offering[410] - to include all that is a burnt offering[411].

On the flaying and the dissection see flaying and dissection. On the precedence of the sprinkling to the flaying, see the aforementioned: their order[412].

On an invalid burnt offering that ascended the altar - when its law is that if it ascended, it shall not descend[413] - they burn it without flaying, see above[414].

On burnt offerings that were offered before the erection of the Tabernacle, and on the day of its erection, if they required flaying and dismembering, see above: in the wilderness and on the high place.

On the burnt offering offered on a bamah* if it requires flaying and dismembering, see also bamah[415], and see also ibid: there. On the skin of the burnt offering, see below: the law of its skin.

Placing the Limbs on the Table

After the dissection, before the raising of the limbs* to the altar, they place the limbs on a marble table in the west of the ramp[416], and this is in the case of an individual's burnt offering, but the limbs of communal burnt offerings are given immediately after their dissection to the one who raises them to the altar[417], for the limbs of an individual's burnt offering can be raised to the altar by a single priest[418], and he cannot raise them all at once, therefore he arranges them first on the table and from there raises them[419].

And there are early authorities who wrote that even the limbs of individual burnt offerings are immediately brought up to the altar, except that sometimes the offerings are numerous and the priest who offers them needs to wait for the offerings on the arrangement to be consumed, and therefore he places the limbs on the table in the meantime[420].

Washing of the innards and legs

The inwards and the legs of a burnt offering require rinsing before their offering[421], as it is stated regarding the burnt offering of cattle: and its inwards and its legs he shall wash in water[422], and similarly it is stated regarding the burnt offering of sheep: and the inwards and the legs he shall wash in water[423], and the intention of the scripture is not for water that contains forty seahs - as there was a place to learn by an analogy* "washing" "washing" from the scripture: and it shall be at evening he shall wash in water[424], which deals with immersion in a mikveh of forty seahs[425], and as it is generally the meaning of the term washing in the Torah[426] - but rather for washing in any amount of water, as it is stated: in water - and it is repeated so in the burnt offering of cattle and the burnt offering of sheep[427] - any amount of water[428].

In seed

Washing of the innards and the legs is valid by a non-priest [429], for "he shall wash" stated in the scripture implies that the owners shall wash [430], and the scripture subsequently states: and the priest shall burn [431], to say that the burning is by a priest and not the washing [432].

And there are some of the early authorities who wrote that the washing is done by a Kohen or a Levite[433].

The Order of Washing and Offering

The washing of the innards and the legs precedes the offering of the burnt offering pieces[434], and even though it is initially stated: “And the sons of Aaron shall arrange the pieces, etc., on the fire which is on the altar”[435], and afterwards: “And its innards and its legs he shall wash with water”[436], the early commentators explained that the command is not to be done in this order, for at the end it is stated: “And the priest shall offer the whole”[437], and the offering of the pieces is included, thus the washing of the innards and the legs precedes[438]. The text only comes to say that initially he shall flay and cut up the burnt offering in order to arrange the pieces on the fire after the washing of the innards and the legs, and then he shall offer everything as one[439].

And from the later ones, there are those who wrote that in the Tabernacle, the burning of the pieces preceded the washing of the innards and legs, according to the order of the verses[440], because immediately after the cutting, they would bring the pieces to the altar and burn them[441], and they should not pass over the commandment and wait in bringing up the pieces until after the washing of the innards and legs - for one does not pass over the commandments* - but in the Temple, where they first place the pieces on the ramp and from there take them to the altar to burn them[442], since the burning does not occur immediately, they wait with bringing up the pieces to the ramp until after the washing of the innards and legs[443].

And there are later authorities who wrote that if the flaying, cutting, and washing are done by the owners - who are fit for them[444] - since they cannot engage in washing while flaying, the priests do not delay the carrying of the pieces until after the washing of the innards and legs, for it is not respectful for the pieces to lie idle. But when priests perform the flaying, cutting, and washing, since they can be done by several priests at once, they wait with the carrying of the pieces until after the washing of the innards and legs to carry everything to the altar as one[445].

The Water

Washing of the innards and the legs is done with water, and not with wine, and not with mixed[446] - wine and water mixed together in the measure of wine mixing[447] - and not with other liquids[448], as it is said: with water[449].

And all the waters - even though they are not “living waters”[450], and likewise salty waters[451] - are fit for washing the innards and the legs[452], as it is said: in water, to make all water fit, and all the more so* for “laver water” - and these

are living waters, which are suitable to be placed in the laver according to those who hold so[453] - that are fit[454].

And from the early ones there are those who wrote that they do not wash the entrails and the legs except from the water of the true waters in the courtyard[455], and later ones were astonished at them, for all waters are fit for this[456].

Water that has an accompanying name, such as strawberry water[457], one does not wash with them the entrails and the legs, as it is said: in water, and not that has an accompanying name[458].

And so the water of the laver - that were placed in the laver and were sanctified in it[459] - have an attached name, and are invalid for washing the innards and the legs[460], and there are those who say that the water of the laver are not considered water that have an attached name, and are valid[461].

The Place of the Rinsing

Place of washing the stomach - which is included in the innards mentioned in the Torah[462] - is in the washing house[463] - it is the washing chamber that was in the courtyard[464] - because the stomach is full of filth and needs to be washed in a modest place[465], and they do not wash it with the other innards, so it does not dirty them[466].

The innards - and they are the intestines[467] - they rinse them on marble tables that are between the pillars[468].

And there are those who say that their rinsing is done on a small table found there which is called a ma’utah[469], and that table is engraved and sloped inward a bit to place intestines in it for washing[470], and this is according to their opinion that which we learned that they rinse the entrails in the ma’utah[471].

And there are those who explained “its reduction” in another manner[472]. And there are those who say that when the sacrifices are numerous, they also wash the innards in the washing chamber[473].

The Measure of the Rinsing

The stomach is washed thoroughly[474], since it is full of filth it needs to be washed well[475], and since there is a stomach that has a lot of filth and there is one that does not have so much filth, no fixed number is set for the washings that it is washed[476].

The innards - and they are the intestines, which do not have so much filth[477] - are rinsed three times[478], sometimes, when the filth does not all come out with less than that[479], and they do not need more rinsing[480].

And there are those who wrote that the innards are rinsed three times at the very least[481], because since they are thin, the filth does not come out of them except with difficulty[482], and they add to rinse them as needed[483].

And there are those that it appears from their words that they always rinse the innards three times[484].

The form of washing the innards

The washing of the entrails, some say it is done when the entrails are placed inside a receptacle called a “ma’utah” - and the term “ma’utah” is from the language of “ma’atan of olives”[485], and from the language of the scripture “its udders are filled with milk”[486] - and there is space for inserting the entrails without pressure, so that they will be washed better, and that receptacle might be a separate vessel and they place it on the marble tables on which the washing is done[487], and it is possible that the tables themselves have a receptacle on one side and in it they wash the entrails, because they do not want to put them in another vessel but on the marble which cools them so they do not spoil, and this is according to their opinion that which we have learned that they wash the entrails in the ma’utah[488].

And there are those who explained “in its minority” in another manner[489].

Washing the Remaining Flesh of the Burnt Offering

The remaining flesh of the burnt offering - besides the entrails and the legs[490] - the early authorities wrote that it is not mentioned in the Mishnah that it is washed[491].

And there are early authorities who wrote that from the language of the verse in Chronicles - “the work of the burnt offering they shall rinse in them”[492] - it appears that one should also rinse the rest of the flesh of the burnt offering[493].

Its Incense Offering

The burnt offering is offered entirely to the fires[494], as it is said: And the priest shall burn all of it on the altar[495], and they carry its limbs to the outer altar and burn them there on the arrangement[496].

On the carrying of the limbs* to the altar, see also carrying: carrying of limbs. On their burning*, see also burning (1): limbs of a burnt offering, and there: the burning and onwards.

On that the burning does not prevent the atonement of the burnt offering, see above mentioned[497]. On the salting of the limbs before their burning, see Salting of Offerings.

On the laying of hands by the High Priest* on the limbs of the daily burnt offering before their offering, when he wishes to offer them himself, due to the honor of the High Priest, see offering[498] and see High Priest[499].

Law of Sacrificial Parts

The burnt offering, later authorities wrote that it does not have the law of sacrificial portions*, because since it is entirely burnt[500], there is no distinction between the sacrificial portions and the flesh[501]. Therefore, they wrote that in this, the power of other sacrifices is greater than the power of the burnt offering, as the vertebrae that are offered with the fat tail* of the lambs of other sacrifices[502], even if they are separated from the flesh, they are burnt, according to their opinion, because since the fat tail is among the sacrificial portions of the lamb[503], and the vertebrae are included, therefore they have the law of sacrificial portions and they need to be burnt even on their own. But in the burnt offering, if the vertebrae are separated, their law is like other bones that are separated, which are not burnt[504], because since in the burnt offering the burning of sacrificial portions was not stated, only the burning of all the flesh, the bones that are separated are not included[505].

Throwing When the Meat is Lost

The burnt offering, since it is entirely consumed[506], its blood is sprinkled, even according to Rabbi Yehoshua - whose ruling is followed - that whenever the flesh is lost, the blood is not sprinkled[507], even when only half an olive's worth of fat and half an olive's worth of flesh remain, since both are offered up and therefore they combine to an olive's worth, unlike other sacrifices, since from them only the specified parts are offered up[508], their blood is not sprinkled, according to those who hold this view, unless an olive's worth of fat remains, which is offered up, or an olive's worth of flesh, which is eaten, since eating and offering up do not combine[509].

On the offering of a burnt offering and other sacrifices, which of them precedes, see also Regular and see Sanctuary. On the precedence of a sin offering to a burnt offering that comes with it, see also Sin Offering: Its Precedence.

The Law of Its Skin

Skin of the burnt offering

The skin of the burnt offering - and likewise the skin of other most holy offerings* [510] - is given to the priests[511], whether of an individual's burnt offering or a communal burnt offering[512] - and even burnt offerings volunteered by the community for the altar's maintenance* are included[513] - as it is said: the skin of the burnt offering which he has offered to the priest shall be his[514], and it is one of the twenty-four priestly gifts*[515].

In the enumeration of the commandments

The giving of the skin of the burnt offering to the priest, the Geonim and Rishonim counted it as a commandment in the enumeration of the commandments*[516].

And there are early authorities who did not count the giving of the skin of the burnt offering to the priest as a commandment in itself[517], but in their opinion, it is included in the commandment of the act of the burnt offering[518].

And there are those who wrote in the opinion of the early authorities that the giving of the skin of the burnt offering is not a commandment at all, for the owners of the sacrifice were not commanded to give the skin to the priest, but

rather the Torah said that the skin shall be the priest's and granted it to him against the will of the owners[519].

Burnt Offering of Converts, Women, and Slaves

One burnt offering of a man and one burnt offering of a woman, their skins to the priests[520], and so the burnt offering of slaves, its skin to the priests[521], as they expounded: burnt offering of a man[522], I have only the burnt offering of a man, women and slaves from where, it is taught to say: the skin of the burnt offering[523], it included[524].

And in the Tosefta, the Tannaim disagree on the matter, and this is the opinion of the Sages, but Rabbi Yosei the son of Rabbi Yehuda says, "A man's burnt offering," to exclude women and slaves[525].

Burnt offering of a convert*, its skin to the priests according to all opinions[526], for the convert is included in "man"[527].

Burnt Offering of a Gentile

Burnt offering of a gentile - that the gentiles volunteer burnt offerings[528] - its skin to the priests[529].

That has no owners

A burnt offering that has no owners, which is of a convert* who died and has no heirs, Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda said its flesh is not for the priests, as it is said: a man's burnt offering[530], excluding the burnt offering of converts[531], and this is the burnt offering of a convert who died and has no heirs[532], since it has no owners it is not included in "a man's burnt offering"[533].

And there are those who say that the Tannaim disagree on the matter, and the opinion of the Sages is that even the burnt offering of a convert who died and has no heirs, its skin goes to the priests, as it is said: the skin of the burnt offering[534], to include the burnt offering of converts[535], and this is the burnt offering of a convert who died and has no heirs[536], that even though it has no owners now, nevertheless from the beginning it had owners, and it is included in

“a man’s burnt offering”[537], and so is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, that they do not exclude from “a man’s burnt offering” the burnt offering of a convert, only the burnt offering of consecrated property[538], and the law is like them[539].

The skin of the burnt offering of a convert who died and has no heirs, according to those who hold that it is not given to the priests[540], early authorities wrote that it is given to the Temple treasury[541].

And there are early authorities who wrote that from the money of the skin they bring the libations of the burnt offering of the convert[542].

The coming from the excesses

A burnt offering that comes from the surplus*, whether according to those who hold that it is offered as a private donation or according to those who hold it is offered as a public donation[543], its skin belongs to the priests[544] - and it is not diminished from “a man’s burnt offering” or from “the burnt offering”[545] - as it is said: It is a guilt offering, a guilt offering to the Lord[546] - and we learned from the beginning of the verse that the surplus of a guilt offering in its existence is like any guilt offering, given to the priests[547], and from the end of the verse that the surplus is given to the Lord[548] - this is the rule, anything that comes because of sin and because of guilt, burnt offerings are taken with it, the flesh to the Lord and the skin to the priests, and thus both verses are fulfilled, a guilt offering to the Lord and a guilt offering to the priests[549], and this is the interpretation of Jehoiada the priest, as it is said: The money of guilt and the money of sin offerings shall not be brought to the house of the Lord, it shall be for the priests[550], and it is impossible that money sanctified for a sin offering and for a guilt offering should benefit the priests, but the intention of the verse is that something should be made from it that the priests benefit from, and that is burnt offerings, whose skins are for the priests[551].

On a burnt offering that was consecrated, or its skin was consecrated, for the maintenance of the Temple*, if its skin is for the priests, see consecration[552].

Permitted by Throwing

The blood is what permits the skin of the burnt offering to the priests[553], for the priests do not acquire the skin except after the sprinkling*[554], as it is said: the skin of the burnt offering which he offered[555], it is only after the sprinkling[556].

An offering that was disqualified

An offering that was disqualified in its sacrifice, such as if it was slaughtered with the intention of being outside its time or outside its place - which is disqualified[557] - since the altar did not merit its flesh, the priests did not merit its skin[558], as it is said: the burnt offering of a man[559], a burnt offering that ascended for a man[560], excluding one slaughtered with the intention of being outside its time or outside its place, whose skin is not for the priests[561].

But a burnt offering that was not disqualified, but did not fulfill the obligation for its owners, such as if it was slaughtered with the intention not for its sake - it is valid but did not fulfill the obligation for its owners[562] - its hide goes to the priests[563], as it is said: the burnt offering[564], in any case[565], and even though it did not fulfill the obligation for its owners, it is not excluded from “a man’s burnt offering” and is included in a burnt offering that was for a man, as only a burnt offering that did not ascend for him on the altar is excluded[566].

The blood is disqualified

A burnt offering that a disqualification occurred in its blood before the sprinkling* - such as if the blood went out or stayed overnight[567] - whether the disqualification occurred before the skin was flayed or whether it occurred after it was flayed, the priests did not merit its skin, even though the blood was eventually sprinkled[568], for the altar did not merit its flesh, and whenever the altar did not merit its flesh, the priests did not merit its skin[569].

On an olah whose blood was disqualified because it became impure - according to those who hold that sacrificial blood* can become impure[570] - if it was sprinkled on the altar, the appeasement of the tzitz* is effective to permit its flesh for the altar and its skin for the priests, see also tzitz.

The meat was disqualified before flaying

Burnt offering - and likewise other most holy sacrifices*[571] - that a disqualification occurred in its flesh - such as it became impure or went out or was left overnight[572] - before the skin was flayed, the Tannaim disagreed whether the disqualification of the flesh causes the skin not to be given to the priests. The opinion of Rabbi is that since the flesh was disqualified - even after it was permitted to the altar by sprinkling[573] - the skin is also not given to the

priests. And the opinion of Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon is that even though the flesh was disqualified before flaying, it is flayed and the skin is given to the priests[574].

And the law is according to Rabbi[575].

Lost or disqualified the meat before sprinkling

Burnt offering - and likewise other most holy sacrifices*[576] - whose flesh was lost or burned or became disqualified - such as became impure or went out[577] - before the sprinkling*, according to Rabbi Eliezer, the blood is sprinkled even though there is no flesh and the offering is valid[578], its skin to the priests[579], according to Rabbi Joshua, the blood is not sprinkled when there is no flesh[580], whenever the blood was sprinkled, the Tannaim disagreed about the law of the skin, Rabbi's opinion is that the blood atones for the skin by itself, and the skin is permitted to the priests, and Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon's opinion is that the blood does not atone for the skin by itself, and the skin is not permitted to the priests[581], and the early authorities disagreed about their opinion, some explained that whenever the flesh was not lost but only disqualified, Rabbi Joshua agrees post facto that if the blood was sprinkled the offering is valid[582], the skin is given to the priests according to all, and they only disagreed about Rabbi Joshua's opinion when the flesh was lost or burned, that the offering is invalid even post facto[583], and Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon holds that since the offering is invalid the skin is not to the priests, and Rabbi disagrees, that the invalidity of the offering post facto because the flesh was lost is a minor disqualification, and since the priests have a loss in the matter the skin is given to the priests even though the offering is invalid[584], and some explained that whenever the flesh was lost or burned, that the offering is invalid according to Rabbi Joshua even post facto, the skin is not to the priests according to all, and the Tannaim only disagreed about his opinion when the flesh exists and is disqualified, that the offering is valid post facto, and Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon holds that there is a decree in the matter that the skin should not be to the priests, as when the flesh was lost or burned that the skin is not to the priests according to their opinion because the offering is invalid, and Rabbi disagrees, that since the offering is valid post facto there is no decree in the matter and the skin is given to the priests[585].

The law is according to Rabbi[586].

On the division of the priests in the skins of the holy offerings - and the skin of the burnt offering included - and on the priests taking a portion in the skins, see also priestly gifts.

Bones of a burnt offering that separated, that sometimes they are permitted for benefit and even to make from them a handle of a knife[587], from the early ones there are those who wrote that even they are given to the priests[588].

The trespass in it and the prohibition of its consumption

The burnt offering, there is misuse in it* from when it was consecrated[589], verbally[590] - like other most holy offerings*[591] - whether one misuses while alive[592], or after slaughter[593].

And even after the sprinkling of its blood, there is misuse in its flesh - for it is considered “sacred to the Lord,” since the altar has acquired it after the sprinkling of the blood[594] - until it goes out to the ash heap[595], because since the burnt offering is entirely consumed[596], and there is no permission for the priests, it is always subject to misuse until it is completely burned on the altar and its ashes go out to the ash heap*, for thus its commandment is fulfilled[597].

On the removal to the ash heap, that the ashes of the sacrifices, and the ashes of the burnt offering in general, are exempt from misuse, whether it is the actual removal of the ashes* or the separation of the ashes*, by which the ashes become fit for removal, see the matter of something whose commandment has been fulfilled[598], and see the external altar’s ashes: misuse and benefit in ashes.

On the ash after its removal, if it is permitted for benefit, see above: there.

Misuse in its skin

The skin of the burnt offering does not have misuse[599], for it is given to the priests[600], and it is excluded from “holy to the Lord”[601], and this is after the sprinkling, for the sprinkling permits the skin to the priests[602], but before the sprinkling, early and later authorities wrote that there is misuse in the skin of the burnt offering[603].

And there are those who inclined towards the opinion of the Rishonim that there is no misuse in the skin of the burnt offering even before the sprinkling[604].

Misuse in Bones

The bones and sinews and horns and hooves that separated from the burnt offering, which are not burned, according to those who hold thus[605], if they separated before the sprinkling, there is misuse in them until the blood is sprinkled[606], once the blood is sprinkled, Rabba's opinion is that there is no misuse in them[607] - and they exit the category of sacred items[608] - for the sprinkling came and permitted them[609], since they had already separated at the time of sprinkling and were not fit for the altar[610], and even to make a handle for a knife from them is permitted[611], for just as the sprinkling permits the flesh of the burnt offering for the altar because it is designated for that, so it permits the bones for mundane use when they are designated for that[612], as Rabbi Yochanan expounded in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: It is stated regarding the burnt offering: it shall be for him[613], and it is stated regarding the guilt offering: it shall be for him[614], just as the bones of the guilt offering are permitted[615], so too the bones of the burnt offering are permitted[616], however, if they only separated after the sprinkling, there is misuse in them forever[617], because since at the time of sprinkling they were connected and designated for burning, the sprinkling fixed them for the altar, and even after they separated later, they are invalid sacred items[618].

And there are early authorities who hold, according to their version in the Gemara, that even according to those who hold that bones and sinews and horns and hooves that were separated, they are burned[619], this is when they were separated after the sprinkling[620], and therefore there is always misuse of them[621], but if they were separated before the sprinkling, the sprinkling permitted them even to make from them a handle of a knife[622], and there is no longer misuse of them[623].

R' Elazar disagrees, and in his opinion, if they separated before the sprinkling, there is always misuse[624], since once they separated and are not fit for burning, the sprinkling does not benefit them and they remain in their prohibition[625]. However, if they separated after the sprinkling, there is no misuse[626] - as expounded by R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael[627], and just as in the guilt offering the sprinkling permits the bones while they are still attached to the flesh, for even the flesh itself is permitted by the sprinkling to the priests[628], so too in the burnt offering the bones are permitted by the sprinkling while they are still attached[629] - but it is forbidden to benefit from them[630], by rabbinic decree[631].

And there are those who wrote, according to their version in the Gemara, that Rabbi Elazar agrees in the case of separating before the sprinkling, that there is no misuse except until the sprinkling[632], and it is even permitted to benefit

from them after the sprinkling[633], and he only disagrees in the case of separating after the sprinkling, that in his opinion there is no misuse, but nevertheless it is forbidden to benefit from them[634].

And there are those who wrote that Rabbi Elazar agrees in the case where it was specified after the sprinkling that there is always misuse[635], and he only disagrees in the case where it was specified before the sprinkling, for in his opinion, even though the sprinkling removes them from the prohibition of misuse, nevertheless it is forbidden to benefit from them[636].

To the law, the Rishonim wrote that bones and sinews and horns and hooves of an olah that separated before the sprinkling, there is misuse in them until the sprinkling, and if they separated after the sprinkling, there is misuse in them forever[637].

On the limbs of a burnt offering that fell off the altar, when is there misuse, see Misuse.

Misuse in the Value of a Burnt Offering

The one who sets aside money for his burnt offering, there is misuse in them[638], from the time he set aside[639].

The one who eats from its flesh

The one who eats from the flesh of an olah offering, Rabbi Shimon said that he transgresses a negative commandment[640], as it is stated: “You may not eat within your gates... and all your vows”[641], “your vows”, this is an olah[642] - which generally comes as a vow[643] - and what does the scripture come to teach us, if for one who eats an olah outside the wall, it is an a fortiori argument from the tithe - for it has already been learned from this verse that one who eats second tithe* outside the wall of Jerusalem transgresses a negative commandment[644] - if for one who eats before the sprinkling of the blood, it is an a fortiori argument from the thanksgiving and peace offerings - for it has already been learned from this verse that one who eats from the flesh of lesser holy offerings* before sprinkling transgresses a negative commandment[645] - if for one who eats after the sprinkling of the blood - and he is a non-priest*[646] - it is an a fortiori argument from the firstborn - for it has already been learned from this verse that a non-priest who eats from the flesh of a firstborn pure animal* transgresses a negative commandment[647] - if for one who eats outside the curtains, it is an a fortiori argument from the sin and guilt offerings - for it has

already been learned from this verse that one who eats from the flesh of most holy offerings* outside the curtains transgresses a negative commandment[648] - the scripture only comes to teach you about one who eats from the olah - whether he is a non-priest or a priest[649] - whether before the sprinkling of the blood or after the sprinkling of the blood, whether outside the curtains or inside the curtains - for we already knew that he transgresses a positive commandment prohibition*[650] - that he transgresses a negative commandment[651], and the scripture is interpreted as if it were stated “You may not eat your vows”, and this is an olah[652].

And among the first ones, there are those who wrote that the sages disagreed with Rabbi Shimon, and in their opinion, we do not learn from the verse “You shall not be able to eat, etc.” a prohibition for eating an offering, and they ruled according to them[653].

To the words of R' Shimon, if they are flogged for the prohibition, the early authorities disagreed: there are those who hold that they are not flogged, for the scripture was not required to prohibit the eating of the burnt offering except after they derived by a fortiori reasoning to prohibit the eating of the burnt offering outside the wall[654], and since they do not warn from the law*, the scripture needed to teach that they are flogged for eating the burnt offering outside the wall, and again it cannot be learned from it that they are flogged for eating it even within the wall[655].

And there are early authorities who hold that one receives lashes[656], some of whom wrote the reason that since the verse is expounded to prohibit the eating of the flesh of an olah offering, this is the prohibition for which one receives lashes, whereas the prohibition of eating an olah outside the wall, which is derived by a fortiori reasoning, required a special exposition to teach that one receives lashes for it[657]. And some of them wrote the reason from the redundancy of the verses, as the verse could have said “You shall not be able to eat them within your gates” without specifying which offerings are forbidden to eat outside the wall, since all those offerings were already specified in the preceding verses[658], and we would automatically know that the verse is dealing with them[659]. The verse did not need to specify all of them except to teach that one receives lashes for all the prohibitions derived from this verse, even though some of them are derived by a fortiori reasoning[660]. And some of the later authorities wrote the reason according to their opinion, that it is a law given to Moses at Sinai* to learn from the verse “You shall not be able to eat, etc.” all the prohibitions derived from it, and therefore one receives lashes for all of them[661].

The one who eats from the flesh of an olah offering, also transgresses a positive commandment, as it is said: “And the sons of Aaron shall arrange, etc., and the priest shall burn the whole on the altar”[662], it is entirely for burning and not for

eating[663].

And there are those who wrote that he transgresses another positive commandment, as it is said: a pleasing aroma to the Lord[664], to the Lord and not to a commoner[665].

In the enumeration of the commandments

The negative commandment not to eat from the flesh of the burnt offering, which is learned from the verse: You may not eat within your gates[666], is counted in the enumeration of the commandments*[667], whereas the prohibition of the positive commandment, which is learned from the verse: And they shall arrange etc.[668], is not counted[669], and there are those who wrote in the opinion of the early authorities that it is included in the commandment of the act of the burnt offering[670].

Combination to an Olive’s Bulk

He ate the fat of an olah offering and its meat and the fine flour and the oil of its meal offering and the wine of its libations - according to those who hold that one receives lashes for eating an olah offering[671] - they all combine to an olive’s bulk to obligate him in lashes[672].

Not because it shall be entirely burnt it shall not be eaten

One who eats from the flesh of an olah - besides that he transgresses a prohibition “You shall not be able to eat, etc., and all your vows,” according to those who hold thus[673] - he transgresses an additional prohibition[674] - which includes the eating of all offerings to the altar[675] - as it is said regarding the meal-offering of priests*: It shall be wholly burnt, it shall not be eaten[676], and Rabbi Eliezer expounded, anything that is wholly burnt is under the prohibition of “it shall not be eaten”[677].

And from the later ones, there are those who wrote that the two prohibitions in eating the flesh of the burnt offering, one of them deals with eating before the sprinkling* and one with eating after the sprinkling, or it is a dispute of Tannaim, the opinion of Rabbi Shimon to prohibit the eating of the flesh of the burnt

offering from “You shall not be able to eat, etc., and all your vows,” and the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer to prohibit from “It shall be wholly burnt, you shall not eat”[678].

Bones of a burnt offering and its horns and its hooves that separated, that sometimes they are permitted for benefit, and even to make from them a handle of a knife[679], among the latter ones there are those who were uncertain if their consumption, such as cooking them a lot with spices until they became fit for eating, is prohibited due to the negative commandment “it shall be wholly burnt, you shall not eat”[680].

If they receive lashes for the prohibition “it shall be entirely burnt, you shall not eat,” see also those liable for lashes: in the Temple and its sanctities[681].

On the prohibition to eat from the flesh of peace offerings* - and all the more so a burnt offering[682] - outside the wall, see also eating of offerings[683].

On the prohibition to eat from the flesh of lesser holy offerings - and all the more so a burnt offering[684] - before sprinkling, see above[685].

On the prohibition to eat from the flesh of sacrifices eaten by the priests - and all the more so a burnt offering[686] - for one who is not a priest but a non-priest*, see also non-priest[687].

On the prohibition to eat from the flesh of most holy sacrifices* - and a burnt offering is included[688] - outside the curtains, see also eating of sacrifices[689].

The negative commandment learned from the verse: “And flesh in the field, a torn animal, you shall not eat”[690], not to eat sacred offerings that went outside their partition[691], does not apply to a burnt offering that went outside the curtains or outside the wall, as it only applies to that which inside is fit to be eaten, and a burnt offering is not fit to be eaten even when it is inside[692].

The negative commandment learned from the verse: “And a stranger shall not eat, for they are holy”[693], that a stranger* shall not eat* most holy things* [694], does not apply to a burnt offering, for it only applies to that which is fit to be eaten by the priests, and a burnt offering is not fit to be eaten even by the priests[695].

The negative commandment learned from the verse: “He shall not eat because it is holy”[696], that anything in the holy that is disqualified, the verse comes to give a prohibition on its consumption[697], does not apply to a burnt offering that was disqualified, as it only applies to what was fit to be eaten before it was disqualified, and a burnt offering even before it was disqualified is not fit to be eaten[698].

On an olah offering sacrificed on a small altar, which is distinguished by several laws from an olah offering sacrificed in the Temple, see also altar[699].

On the blood of a burnt offering that entered inside, if the burnt offering was disqualified thereby, see also the blood of a sin offering[700].

On one who designates a female for a burnt offering, if sanctity applies to it and if it is sanctified with bodily sanctity*, see bodily sanctity.

On one who separates a female for a burnt offering and she gave birth, see also offspring of sacred animals[701].

Footnotes

1. ↑ See Na’am David below.
2. ↑ See Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 and in the introduction to the commentary on the Mishnah for Tractate Zevachim. And see Ma’aseh HaKorbanot there that besides these there are three additional offerings which are: firstborn, tithe, and Passover, and see Na’am David there that those offerings each have their own matter and are not general categories like burnt offering, sin offering, guilt offering, and peace offering, and see R. Yosef Korkos there.
3. ↑ See citation 494 and onwards.
4. ↑ See Tanchuma Tzav 1: The burnt offering, no creature tastes from it but it is entirely for the Holy One, blessed be He, therefore it is called a burnt offering, for it ascends to the Holy One, blessed be He, who is exalted; Ibn Ezra Genesis 8:20 and Leviticus 6:2; Bechor Shor Leviticus 1:3; see R. Chaim Paltiel Leviticus 6:2. And further in Tanchuma there: Why is it called a burnt offering, because it is the highest of all offerings, further there: What is a burnt offering, it ascends before the Holy One, blessed be He, and atones for the sins of Israel, and it needs clarification if they are reasons for its name or in a homiletic manner.
5. ↑ See citation 116.
6. ↑ Ibn Ezra Leviticus 1:4; R. Chaim Paltiel there; Rabbeinu Bachya Leviticus 6:2. And see Ibn Ezra and R. Chaim Paltiel there, that this name is similar to the name sin offering which comes for a sin. And see Targum Yonatan Leviticus there.
7. ↑ See citation 109 and onwards.

8. ↑ HaKetav VeHaKabbalah Leviticus 1:3, and see there that we find the term burnt offering (with patach and sheva) whose vocalization is like burnt offering (with cholam).
9. ↑ See also Tamid. R. Chaim Paltiel there.
10. ↑ R. Samson Raphael Hirsch Leviticus 1:3.
11. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 53b; Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 Halacha 17.
12. ↑ See Gemara Zevachim there and the commentary on the Mishnah by Rambam Zevachim Perek 5 Mishnah 4 and Ra'avad there,
13. ↑ See Leviticus 6:18 and there 22 and there 7:1 and there 6, and more.
14. ↑ See citation 294 and onwards.
15. ↑ Commentary on the Mishnah and Ra'avad there.
16. ↑ See citation 494 and onwards.
17. ↑ See Mishnah Zevachim 89a and Rashi below.
18. ↑ Rashi there 53b s.v. and answers.
19. ↑ See Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 Halacha 4 and onwards and the introduction to the commentary on the Mishnah for Tractate Zevachim, and see below.
20. ↑ See Rambam there and there, and see below.
21. ↑ See also Tamid.
22. ↑ See also Additional Offering.
23. ↑ See also the aforementioned.
24. ↑ See also Omer.
25. ↑ See also Two Loaves.
26. ↑ See also "Ail Ha'am."
27. ↑ See also "Shgagat Hora'ah" and see "Se'irei Avodah Zarah." And see Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 Halacha 5 that it is a communal offering, and see Peirush HaMishnayot of Rambam in the introduction to Tractate Zevachim, that it is a communal offering similar to an individual offering.
28. ↑ See also "Yoledet" and see "Olat Yoledet."
29. ↑ See also "Nazir" and see "Olat Nazir."
30. ↑ See also "Metzora" and see "Olat Metzora."
31. ↑ See also "Re'iyah" and see "Olat Re'iyah."
32. ↑ See also "Lo Yera'u Panai Reikam."
33. ↑ See also "Ailo Shel Aharon" and see "Avodat Yom HaKippurim." And see Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 Halacha 6 that it is an individual offering, and see Peirush HaMishnayot of Rambam in the introduction to Tractate Zevachim, that it is an individual offering similar to a communal offering.
34. ↑ See also "Gerut" citation 160 and onwards.
35. ↑ See below and see also "Neder" and "Nedavah."
36. ↑ See below and see also "Motarot" and see "Kitz HaMizbeach." And see citation 263 and onwards, regarding an offering set aside by most of Israel if it is considered a communal offering.

37. ↑ See Exodus 24:4 and onwards, and see also “Gerut” citation 81 and onwards. And see Ibn Ezra there 20:21 and 24:5, that regarding this offering Moses was commanded there 20:21: “An altar of earth you shall make for Me, and you shall sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and your peace offerings” (and this is according to those who hold that after the giving of the Torah they were offered, see there). And see Chagigah 6a, where the Tannaim disagreed, some say the offerings that were offered were the regular burnt offerings, practiced for generations, see citation 21, and some say they were the burnt offerings of appearance, practiced for generations, see citation 31. And see Chagigah there 2 where they were uncertain if the offerings were bulls or sheep.
38. ↑ See Baraita of Seder Olam in Shabbat 88a, and see Chagigah there 1 and Rashi there s.v. “Yeshna”; Tanna Kamma in Mekhilta of Rabbi Yishmael Tractate of the Month, Parasha 3.
39. ↑ Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda in Mekhilta there, and Ramban there 24:1 in his opinion, and see Ramban there who concluded that this is heard as he said according to the law; see Targum Yonatan Exodus 24:1; see Rashbam there; see Ibn Ezra Exodus 20:21.
40. ↑ Mekhilta of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai Exodus 24:4.
41. ↑ See also the above, and see there that this offering is like the offering brought by a convert to complete his conversion, practiced for generations, see citation 34.
42. ↑ See also “Miluim.” And see there that there are those who hold that the Miluim are practiced for generations, and see Ezekiel 43 and there 45.
43. ↑ See also “Chanukat HaMikdash.” And see there citation 7 and onwards, that there are those who hold that the dedication of the Temple is practiced for generations but there is no command regarding the nature of the offerings to be brought in it, and see 1 Kings 8:64 and Radak there that also in the dedication of the Temple made by Solomon burnt offerings were offered, and see Ezra 6:17 that it is stated that also for the dedication of the Second Temple burnt offerings were offered, and see the commentary of Maharam Zvi to Lamentations Rabbah Parasha 1, who proved from the Midrash that in the dedication made by Solomon burnt offerings were offered in the number of the peace offerings specified in the text, which is 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep, and see Meromei Sadeh Zevachim 59b, that the oxen and sheep specified in the text were burnt offerings, and it is not stated there that peace offerings were offered except for the bulls donated by the princes with the wagons for the Tabernacle, as stated in Numbers Rabbah Naso 12, and see Radak there who does not hold this view.
44. ↑ See also citation 40, and see Chagigah there 1 and Rashi there s.v. “Shtayim.”
45. ↑ See also “Levi: His Education for Service.” And see there citation 481 and onwards, that there are those who hold that the bull was offered according to the law of the bull brought for the error of the community in idolatry by the ruling of the court, which is practiced for generations, see citation 27.

46. ↑ See the omission to “Eretz Yisrael” citation 1 and onwards, and see also “Blessings and Curses.”
47. ↑ See Deuteronomy 27:6 and Joshua 8:31, and see also “Hora’at Sha’ah” citation 74 and onwards.
48. ↑ See Leviticus 1:3 and onwards and Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 and there Halacha 8 and in the introduction to Peirush HaMishnayot to Tractate Zevachim.
49. ↑ See Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 Halacha 8.
50. ↑ See Shekalim Perek 7 Mishnah 4; see Torat Kohanim below (regarding a voluntary burnt offering, and see Kesef Mishneh and Radbaz Ma’aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 Halacha 8 that from the scriptures stated regarding a voluntary burnt offering we learn for all burnt offerings, and see Torat Kohanim there); see Sotah 32b and Menachot 3a; see Zevachim 75b; see Temurah 14a; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot Perek 1 Halacha 8 and in the introduction to Peirush HaMishnayot to Tractate Zevachim. And see Ibn Ezra Leviticus 1:3, that since the burnt offering is entirely for the Most High, it comes from the male which is chosen over the female. And see also “Bamah” citation 183 that a female burnt offering is valid on a private altar.
51. ↑ Leviticus there. And it is also stated in Leviticus 22:19: “To be accepted for you, it shall be a male without blemish, of the cattle, of the sheep, or of the goats,” and they expounded there to exclude birds that do not require maleness, see also bird burnt offering, and see Chizkuni there that this verse is about a voluntary burnt offering and the verse in Leviticus 1 is about an obligatory burnt offering, and this requires further study.
52. ↑ Torat Kohanim, Dibura d’Nedava, Parasha 3.
53. ↑ Leviticus there 10.
54. ↑ Torat Kohanim there. And see also sacrifices, that a tumtum and an androgynous are invalid for all sacrifices, and see Torat Kohanim there why a derivation was needed to exclude them in a burnt offering, and see the commentary of Rabbi Chaim Paltiel on Leviticus there.
55. ↑ Mishnah Menachot 90b; Rambam, Maaseh HaKorbanot 2:2. And see there 91b and Rambam there that even obligatory burnt offerings specified in the Torah that do not state they require libations, such as the lamb of a woman after childbirth and the ram of the High Priest, are obligated in libations.
56. ↑ See citation 19.
57. ↑ See Sifrei Shelach 107 and Menachot there and there and Tosafot there 90b s.v. “what.”
58. ↑ See citation 36.
59. ↑ Mishnah Temurah 20b; Rambam, Maaseh HaKorbanot 3:7. And see Responsa Beit Yosef Orach Chaim, Siman 12, where he was uncertain, and this requires further study.
60. ↑ Rambam, Sefer HaMitzvot, Shoresh 12 and Positive Commandment 63, and Maaseh HaKorbanot 6:1; Sefer Mitzvot Gadol, Positive Commandment 180; Sefer HaChinuch, Mitzvah 115.

61. ↑ Leviticus 1:2-3. Sefer HaMitzvot, Positive Commandment there. And see Marganita Tava, Shoreshim there, that this commandment is also learned from Leviticus 6:2: “This is the law of the burnt offering.”
62. ↑ Rambam there and Sefer Mitzvot Gadol there and Sefer HaChinuch there.
63. ↑ See Leviticus 1.
64. ↑ See Sefer HaMitzvot, Shoreshim there.
65. ↑ See Sefer HaMitzvot, Positive Commandment there.
66. ↑ See Rambam, Maaseh HaKorbanot there and there 20; see Sefer Mitzvot Gadol there; see Sefer HaChinuch there.
67. ↑ See entry “The Simple and Analysis”: those engaged in them, and see “Slaughtering (Holy Things).”
68. ↑ See entry “Values of the Various Sacrificial Services.”
69. ↑ See citation 55 and see “Libations.”
70. ↑ See below: “The Law of Its Skin” and see “Priestly Gifts.” Sefer HaMitzvot, Shoreshim there. And see Sefer HaMitzvot there and Sefer HaChinuch there that did not mention that the laying of hands on the sacrifice is part of this commandment, and perhaps their opinion is that since it is the owner’s commandment, it is part of the commandment of bringing the burnt offering, see below, and see R. Yitzchak Perla, Positive Commandments 113-114, and see Igrot Moshe, Even HaEzer, Part 1, Siman 157, that the laying of hands is part of the commandment of the act of the burnt offering. And see Sefer HaMitzvot there, that salting is a separate commandment, and see also “Salting.”
71. ↑ See Rashi, Chullin 133a s.v. “sprinklings” in the explanation of the Baraita there, and see Ramban in his critiques on Sefer HaMitzvot there that this Baraita is the source of the services that Behag listed below as separate commandments.
72. ↑ Behag in the introduction.
73. ↑ Saadia Gaon, Positive Commandments 107-109. And see R. Yitzchak Perla there.
74. ↑ See Ramban’s critiques there and Megillat Esther there in the words of Rambam there.
75. ↑ See below.
76. ↑ See Ramban’s critiques there on Rambam’s opinion and Megillat Esther and Lev Sameach and Marganita Tava there.
77. ↑ See Ramban below, and see there that he also wrote, that since its performance is like the performance of obligatory burnt offerings which is part of the commandment of bringing them, it should not be considered a separate commandment.
78. ↑ Numbers 18:7.
79. ↑ Ramban’s critiques there.
80. ↑ Chinuch there; see Ramban’s critiques there on Rambam’s opinion and Lev Sameach and Marganita Tava there. And seemingly the matters refer to the acts of the burnt offering whose commandments are upon the priests, but the slaughtering, skinning, and dissecting, which are valid by a non-priest, their commandment is incumbent upon all Israel.

81. ↑ See citation 494.
82. ↑ See Avot de-Rabbi Natan chapter 4, and see Rabbeinu Bahya Leviticus 6:2 and Baal HaTurim Numbers 28:3.
83. ↑ Tanchuma below. And see Midrash Hashkem below: superior to all sacrifices.
84. ↑ See also Sin Offering and see Guilt Offering and see Meal Offering.
85. ↑ See also Peace Offerings.
86. ↑ Tanchuma Tzav 1.
87. ↑ Midrash below, and seemingly it means that it does not come as an obligation due to sin, see citation 156.
88. ↑ Midrash Hashkem in Otzar HaMidrashim, brought in Tzror HaMor Parashat Tzav.
89. ↑ Bamidbar Rabbah below; Tanchuma below.
90. ↑ Bamidbar Rabbah Naso 13. And see citation 87.
91. ↑ Psalms 51:20-21. Tanchuma Tzav 14.
92. ↑ See citation 19. And see citation 151.
93. ↑ See Zevachim 5b and there 6a; see Tosefta Menachot chapter 10. And see below. And see Makkot 17b and Zevachim there 1, that it is said that a burnt offering does not atone, and see Tosafot Arachin 21b s.v. Mai. And see Tosafot Zevachim there 1 s.v. Al Mi, that it is said from their version there: burnt offering, and similarly Rambam Commentary on the Mishnah chapter 15 halacha 14, see Merkevet HaMishneh and Or Sameach there, that one should not offer a voluntary burnt offering without a sin that the burnt offering atones for (and therefore there is no change of owners in offering a burnt offering for someone who is not obligated at all, as the burnt offering is not suitable for him, but there is no person in Israel who is not obligated in a positive commandment, see there), and see Tosafot there 6a s.v. D'i and Romi Sadeh there.
94. ↑ Leviticus 1:4.
95. ↑ Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah chapter 4. And see there that R. Shimon disagrees, and see citation 116. And see Rashi Zevachim 5b s.v. Man: that the place is appeased for him.
96. ↑ Tosafot Zevachim 7b s.v. Olah, and see Magen Avraham and Pri Megadim and Machatzit HaShekel siman 1 se'if katan 8. And see Zevachim 6a regarding the atonement of an heir they said it atones superficially, see also Heir (1) citation 711, and it seems that for the original owners it atones permanently. And see Likutei Halachot Zevachim there, that one who brought a sin offering, which atones for a positive commandment superficially, see Zevachim 7a, should bring a burnt offering to atone for him permanently, and see Panim Meirot Zevachim 6a who disagrees, that one who has already been atoned for superficially is not required to bring a burnt offering for permanent atonement.
97. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim 6a s.v. U'Meshani.
98. ↑ See Tosafot Shevuot 13a s.v. D'avad. And see Machatzit HaShekel Orach Chaim siman 1 se'if katan 8: complete atonement.

99. ↑ Tosafot Bava Batra 48a s.v. Yakriv; Ramban Chullin 40b; Pnei Yehoshua Berachot 28a and more.
100. ↑ Rashi there.
101. ↑ See Tosafot Shevuot there. And see Shiyarei Korban Shevuot 1:3: that he slightly lightens his sin.
102. ↑ See Tziyon 204. Tosafot Bava Batra there. On the concept of “Kofya” atonement, see Chazon Ish to Tosefta Zevachim 1:1 and Ketzot HaChoshen Zevachim Siman 6.
103. ↑ See also Chayavei Mitot Beit Din Tziyon 34 and see Chayavei Mitah Bidei Shamayim and see Chayavei Malkot Tziyon 27. And a sin offering, which comes for inadvertence, is only for something whose intentional act incurs karet, see also Sin Offering.
104. ↑ Ramban Leviticus 1:4. And see Gevurot Ari Leviticus there at its end similarly, and see there the reason that a burnt offering comes specifically for intentional sin. And see Rash to Torat Kohanim there, that it is not reasonable to establish the atonement of the burnt offering for inadvertent transgression of a prohibition.
105. ↑ Ramban there.
106. ↑ Kuntres Acharon to Torat Kohanim below, and see Gevurot Ari there similarly.
107. ↑ Kuntres Acharon there. And see there further in another manner, that appeasement is a proper correction for one who neglected a positive commandment and lost the closeness to God that was supposed to come with the fulfillment of the commandment, but one who transgresses a prohibition and thereby distanced himself from God, the proper correction for him is atonement and not appeasement. And see Gevurot Ari there in another manner, that since the burnt offering is more severe than the sin offering, it certainly does not come to atone for those inadvertent transgressions for which there is no sin offering, which are lighter, but rather comes for intentional transgressions for which no punishment is stated, and see Kuntres Acharon there who disagrees.
108. ↑ See Prohibition Attached to a Positive Commandment: One who transgresses it is exempt from lashes, and see there Tziyon 126 and onwards Shiyarei Korban, and see there: Instances where one who transgresses it is lashed, as there are instances where he is lashed according to all opinions.
109. ↑ Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Nedava 4. And see Zevachim 5b. And see Rash to Torat Kohanim there, that it should not be said that a burnt offering atones for those liable for death or lashes intentionally without warning, who are not punished, see also Warning, because we do not find atonement for intentional sin without warning that is not effective for intentional sin with warning, and see Rashash Yoma there.
110. ↑ Tanchuma Lech 10.
111. ↑ Etz Yosef to Tanchuma there.
112. ↑ Tosefta Menachot 10, brought in Yoma 36a.

113. ↑ Tosefta there. And see Yoma there on what Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and Rabbi Akiva disagreed.
114. ↑ See also Prohibition Attached to a Positive Commandment Tziyon 953 and onwards and see Leket Shikcha and Peah Tziyon 791 and onwards.
115. ↑ See Rashi Yoma there 2 s.v. and Rabbi Yosei HaGalili and Ritva there 1 and Shaarei Rachamim there. And see Kesef Mishneh Maaseh HaKorbanot 3:14, who says that he holds that according to Rabbi Yosei HaGalili, a burnt offering does not atone for a positive commandment or a prohibition attached to a positive commandment, and it needs clarification, and see Mayim Chaim there.
116. ↑ Tanchuma there; Vayikra Rabbah Tzav 7; Pesikta Zutrata Tzav. And so it is stated anonymously in Jerusalem Talmud Yoma 8:7 and Tanchuma Tetzaveh 15 and Tzav 7 and Vayigash and Zohar Pinchas Ramaz 2 and Raaya Mehemna Pinchas 254b. And see Tanchuma Lech there that for this reason Abraham was commanded to offer his son as a burnt offering. And see Tanchuma Tetzaveh there that peace offerings atone for a positive commandment. And see Ramban Leviticus 1:4, that since only God recognizes the thought, therefore the burnt offering is entirely for God, and see Zohar there. And see Torat Kohanim there, that according to Rabbi Shimon, we do not expound “and it shall be accepted for him” that the burnt offering atones, see Tziyon 95.
117. ↑ Job 1:5. Jerusalem Talmud there and Tanchuma Lech there and Tzav there and there and Vayikra Rabbah there.
118. ↑ Ezekiel 20:32. Vayikra Rabbah there, and so it is stated anonymously in Jerusalem Talmud there and in Tanchuma Tzav 13. And see Tziyon 6.
119. ↑ See also Sin Offering: Its obligation for inadvertence and see Suspended Guilt Offering. The following Rishonim.
120. ↑ Bechor Shor Leviticus 1:4; Da’at Zekenim Mibaalei HaTosafot and Hadar Zekenim there.
121. ↑ See Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 3:14.
122. ↑ See Yoma 36b, that according to those who hold that one does not receive lashes for eating carrion because the prohibition is attached to a positive commandment of “to the stranger in your gates you shall give it and he shall eat it,” see also Prohibition Attached to a Positive Commandment Tziyon 29, a burnt offering is effective to atone for the prohibition, even though the transgressor cannot fulfill the positive commandment. And see Chasdei David below, who says that according to Tosafot in Tziyon 139, even when one does not receive lashes for the prohibition, as long as he cannot fulfill the positive commandment (such as when the positive commandment is nullified on its own according to those who hold “he nullified it and did not nullify it,” see also the above Tziyon 612 and onwards) a burnt offering does not atone for it, and it needs clarification.
123. ↑ See also Prohibition Attached to a Positive Commandment Tziyon 613 and onwards.
124. ↑ See also the above Tziyon 610.
125. ↑ See also Tziyon 602 and onwards.

126. ↑ See Meiri Yoma there; Chasdei David Menachot Chapter 10 in the words of Tosafot in Tziyon 139. And see the Baraita in Tziyon 109 that the atonement of the burnt offering is for a sin whose punishment is not stated. And see Chemdat Shlomo Yoma there, who sided with the aforementioned Tosafot, that even when one is flogged for a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment, the burnt offering atones for it, because even though it is impossible to rectify the prohibition by fulfilling the positive commandment now, it is possible to fulfill that positive commandment elsewhere and thereby appease for the transgression of the prohibition, and this requires further study, for after all, he is liable for flogging and his punishment is stated, and see Tosafot there.
127. ↑ Nachal Yitzchak Choshen Mishpat Siman 34 Se'if Katan 1. See Chasdei David there.
128. ↑ Chiddushei Maharal Ribit Siman 161 Se'if Katan 3. And see Nachal Yitzchak there in the opinion of Netivot HaMishpat there.
129. ↑ See Nachal Yitzchak there.
130. ↑ Maharal there; see Chasdei David there; Chemdat Shlomo there in the gloss. And see Aseret Ma'amarot Chikur Din Part 1 Chapter 16, regarding the atonement of repentance alone for a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment, see Yoma 85b, which is when the positive commandment is fulfilled.
131. ↑ See also Prohibition in General Tziyon 445, and there Tziyon 453 and onwards Shi"Ch, and see also Prohibition without Action Tziyon 27 and onwards, and there Tziyon 24 and onwards Shi"Ch.
132. ↑ See Tziyon 109.
133. ↑ Tosafot below. And see Kedushat Yom Tov Ma'arekhet Kodesh Chapter 3 Halacha 14, who was in doubt.
134. ↑ Leviticus 1:4.
135. ↑ See Tziyon 95.
136. ↑ See Tziyon 109.
137. ↑ See Tziyon 109.
138. ↑ Tosafot below.
139. ↑ Tosafot Yoma 36a s.v. "on".
140. ↑ See also Prohibition Derived from a Positive Commandment Tziyon 144.
141. ↑ See also Prohibition Subject to Compensation Tziyon 1 and onwards.
142. ↑ See Aseret Ma'amarot below.
143. ↑ See Aseret Ma'amarot Chikur Din Part 1 Chapter 18. And see there that this does not include prohibitions that are not flogged due to their severity, such as a prohibition that is a warning for a death penalty by the court, see there. And see Takanat HaShavin Letter 13 (page 139 and onwards), and see Siddur HaGra Ashi Yisrael page 459 in the commentary of Pnei Aryeh on the Yom Kippur confession text "and for sins for which we are liable a burnt offering", and see Igrot Moshe Orach Chaim Part 1 Siman 175 that the opinion of Rashi Yoma there. And see Tosafot Zevachim 6a s.v. "for if", who discussed that the burnt offering atones for the thought of not for its sake in

sacrifices, and this seems to be the prohibition of “it shall not be considered” which is a prohibition without action, see Zevachim 29b and see Thought in Sacrifices.

144. ↑ Kli Yakar Leviticus 6:3, based on Vayikra Rabbah Leviticus 7.
145. ↑ See Tziyon 109
146. ↑ See Yoma 36a and b, in the discussion of “and a carcass”, that according to those who hold that they are not a prohibition rectified by a positive commandment, it is not atoned by a burnt offering, and it seems that since he is liable for flogging for the transgression of the prohibition, his punishment also serves for the atonement of the positive commandment.
147. ↑ Rashi to Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Nedavah Chapter 4; see Ramban below; Ritva Yoma 36a.
148. ↑ See Ramban Leviticus 1:4, and see Tziyon 104 and the gloss in the aforementioned Tziyon. And see Gevurot Ari Yoma 85b, and see Responsa Chazon Ish Part 1 Siman 7.
149. ↑ Meiri Yoma there.
150. ↑ See Tziyon 28. Gemara below.
151. ↑ See Zevachim 5b and Rashi there s.v. Man. And the language of the Talmud needs clarification, which is said in astonishment: And who will tell us that if it were so, how much did he do, they would not be atoned.
152. ↑ See Rashi below, and see Gemara below which states that the same applies to other communal burnt offerings besides those that come with the Omer and the two loaves.
153. ↑ See Pesachim 77a and Rashi there s.v. She’ar.
154. ↑ See above. Rashi there.
155. ↑ See Orach Chaim Siman 283 Se’if Katan 3.
156. ↑ Rashi Zevachim 6a s.v. Kivan; see Ramban Vayikra 1:4; see K.A. to Torat Kohanim there; Aruch Laner Makkot 17b, and see Ritva Makkot there; Gilyonot Vayikra 12:7. And the wording of the confession for Yom Kippur needs clarification: sins for which we are liable for a burnt offering.
157. ↑ Zevachim 6a.
158. ↑ See citation 156.
159. ↑ See citation 204.
160. ↑ Vayikra 1:4.
161. ↑ See citation 95.
162. ↑ See Rashi below according to the version of Shitah Mekubetzet there.
163. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there s.v. Kivan.
164. ↑ See above.
165. ↑ See also Chattat citation 284 and onwards, that the separation of the sin offering must be for the sake of the sin.
166. ↑ Zevachim 6a.
167. ↑ See also the aforementioned citation 312.
168. ↑ See citation 157.
169. ↑ And see Tosafot Shabbat 72b s.v. Ki, which writes the reason that a burnt offering atones for a positive commandment after separation because it is a gift, and see Chiddushei HaRan Shabbat there which writes the reason

because a burnt offering is not obligatory but the one who volunteers a burnt offering it atones for him, and see citation 156 and citation 163.

170. ↑ See Zevachim 7a, which is the opinion of Rabbi Yirmiyah who was uncertain similarly regarding the goats of Atzeret, and see Tosafot there 6a s.v. Le'achar.
171. ↑ Zevachim 7a.
172. ↑ Zevachim 6a. And see there that it explains the derivation of the Baraita there (Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah Perek 4) that if one offered a burnt offering without laying hands, the scripture considers it as if he did not atone and atoned, meaning that the burnt offering did not atone for the neglect of the commandment of laying hands, because the neglect is considered as a positive commandment after slaughter.
173. ↑ See Tosafot Shabbat 72a s.v. Ki, and see Ramban there in the name of Tosafot. And see Tosafot there who deliberated that according to Rav Dimi Shabbat there a burnt offering atones for transgressions after separation and according to Ulla there it is doubtful.
174. ↑ See Tosafot below.
175. ↑ See Zevachim 7a and Tosafot there s.v. Chattat.
176. ↑ See citation 156.
177. ↑ Thanksgiving offering Zevachim there.
178. ↑ See also heir (1) citation 589, and see citation 241.
179. ↑ See Zevachim 7b. And see Zevachim 5a and Menachot 4b.
180. ↑ See citation 109 and onwards.
181. ↑ See citation 156. See Meiri Kiddushin 13b.
182. ↑ See Zevachim there and one of the early commentators there.
183. ↑ Citation 707 and onwards.
184. ↑ Jerusalem Talmud Yoma 8:7, according to the version before us, which is the version of the KAH"R there, and so it is in the SHI"K Shevuot 1:6.
185. ↑ KAH"R there.
186. ↑ Leviticus 1:3.
187. ↑ SHI"K there. And it must be said that since he desires the offering, but does not desire its atonement, it is not invalidated as an offering brought unwillingly, but it does not atone for him.
188. ↑ Jerusalem Talmud there.
189. ↑ KAH"R there and SHI"K there.
190. ↑ SHI"K there.
191. ↑ KAH"R Shevuot there according to his version in the Jerusalem Talmud there; PN"M Yoma there and Shevuot there.
192. ↑ KAH"R Shevuot there in the opinion of Rabbi Hanina bar Hillel there; PN"M in the opinion of the first Amora in the Jerusalem Talmud there.
193. ↑ See Keritot 7a and the commentary below.
194. ↑ See citation 156.
195. ↑ KAH"R Shevuot there.
196. ↑ KAH"R Shevuot there in the opinion of the first Amora in the Jerusalem Talmud there; PN"M in the opinion of Rabbi Hanina bar Hillel there. And see the commentary Shevuot there which inclined that even according to Rabbi

Hanina bar Hillel it does not atone.

197. ↑ PN"M there and there.
198. ↑ See also thought in sanctities.
199. ↑ Rashi Zevachim 6a s.v. “If you say.” And it needs clarification, for an offering brought not for its sake is considered a freewill offering, see Zevachim 2a, and even a burnt offering brought as a freewill offering atones for the transgressions that a burnt offering atones for, and similarly, it needs clarification regarding a burnt offering brought as a freewill offering and offered not for its sake, that he does not bring another, if it atoned for the transgressions that a burnt offering atones for, and see TAH"K there 6a and SHP"A there 5b, and see Chaz"Y to Tosefta Zevachim 1:1.
200. ↑ See citation 93. See Tosafot Zevachim 7b s.v. “Olah.” And see Tosafot there that it atones for a positive commandment more than a sin offering, for a sin offering atones for a positive commandment “from the surface,” see Zevachim there, and a burnt offering atones “from the root,” see citation 96, and see citation 99 SHI"Y.
201. ↑ See also “sacrifice of the wicked.” Rava below. And see “sacrifice of thanksgiving” Zevachim 6a, meaning that for this reason it does not atone, even though it is not invalidated thereby since its primary bringing is for a donation. And see Gevurat Ari Yoma 85b, that if the burnt offering comes for a transgression of a positive commandment inadvertently, according to those who hold so, see note 149, it is always considered as if he has already repented, and it atones for him, and see Shefa Tal Zevachim 7b.
202. ↑ See Baraita in Yoma 86a and the Gemara below and see also “repentance.”
203. ↑ See note 109.
204. ↑ Rava in Zevachim 7b. And see there that they proved this from the words of Rabbi Shimon in the Baraita.
205. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there s.v. “burnt offering,” and see the Baraita there. And see Lev David chapter 4, who holds that Rava disagrees with those who say the burnt offering atones, and see Beit Yitzchak Teshuva chapter 1 halacha 4. And see Mayim Chaim Ma’aseh HaKorbanot chapter 3 halacha 14, who wonders why they confess on a burnt offering for a transgression of a positive commandment, see Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot there, for it has already been atoned by repentance and the burnt offering is only a gift. And see Tiferet Yisrael Zevachim there who wonders, that a burnt offering that comes for a prohibition that is rectified by a positive commandment, see note 109, seemingly is not a gift, because repentance alone is not enough, and see Takanat HaShavin letter 14 (page 142).
206. ↑ See note 156.
207. ↑ Pe’anach Raza Vayikra 1:4, and similarly in the commentary of Riva there. And see Beit Yitzchak there. And see Moshev Zekenim Vayikra there in the first explanation, that the atonement of repentance is temporary and the burnt offering atones permanently.

208. ↑ Shiyarei Korban Shevuot chapter 1 halacha 6 (7b), and see there that according to this, the Talmudic discussion in the chapter “Rabbi Eliezer” in Yoma 86b, that intentional sins become merits through repentance out of love, disagrees with Rava who suspends on the sacrifice.
209. ↑ Principles of the Commandments, Atonement.
210. ↑ See Mishnah Zevachim 103a and the Gemara there; Torat Kohanim below; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot chapter 3 halacha 2.
211. ↑ See the Gemara Zevachim there; Torat Kohanim below.
212. ↑ Leviticus 22:18.
213. ↑ Torat Kohanim Emor section 7. And see Rabbi Yosef Korkos and Kesef Mishneh on Rambam there that a woman offers because the scripture equated her to a man for all laws in the Torah, see also “woman” note 347, and Kesef Mishneh and Radbaz there that a slave offers because his law is like a woman’s, see also “slave,” and it needs clarification, and see Rabbi Yosef Korkos and Kesef Mishneh there for additional proofs that a woman offers. And see Rabbi Shimon to Torat Kohanim there in the editor’s addition, that the scripture did not need to include women, slaves, and converts except to learn from the following scripture to include gentiles, see note 216. And see Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Nedavah section 2 and Jerusalem Talmud Shekalim chapter 1 halacha 4: “man,” to include converts, and see Rabbi Shimon and Raavad and Keren Orah to Torat Kohanim there, and see Responsa Maharit part 2 siman 125, and see Responsa Harid siman 84 that this derivation comes to teach that converts lay hands, and see Birkei Yosef Orach Chaim siman 680.
214. ↑ Menachot 73b; Torat Kohanim Emor section 7; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot chapter 3 halacha 2 and Kings chapter 10 halacha 10.
215. ↑ Leviticus 22:18.
216. ↑ Baraita Menachot there and similar, and Torat Kohanim there.
217. ↑ Leviticus there. See Menachot there and Torat Kohanim there.
218. ↑ Note 234 and onwards and note 253 and onwards.
219. ↑ See note 204 and onwards. See Chullin there 2.
220. ↑ Baraita Chullin 5a; Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Nedavah section 2; see Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot chapter 3 halacha 4.
221. ↑ See note 214. See Rambam there.
222. ↑ Leviticus 1:2.
223. ↑ Baraita Chullin there.
224. ↑ Baraita Chullin there; Torat Kohanim there.
225. ↑ See Torat Kohanim there and Raavad there in his explanation, and see Keren Orah there.
226. ↑ Proverbs 21:27. Torat Kohanim there. And see also “The Sacrifice of the Wicked” Zion 1 and onwards, regarding the reason why it was necessary to expound from “from you” to exclude an apostate, and it is not sufficient that “the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination.”
227. ↑ See also Apostate.

228. ↑ Leviticus there. And see Rashi Chullin there s.v. “from” and Ritva in his explanation, that the exposition is from the word “the animal” and not from the word “from.”
229. ↑ Rashi there s.v. “with.”
230. ↑ Baraita Chullin there and Gemara there in its explanation. And see Pnei Yehoshua there, that an apostate to idolatry and to desecrate Sabbaths publicly, we do not accept offerings from him even according to those who hold he is not an apostate for the entire Torah, but according to their view, there is no need for an exposition from “from the animal” to include an apostate for one matter.
231. ↑ See above: Atonement.
232. ↑ See also Apostate and see Errors.
233. ↑ See Zion 204 and onwards. See Ritva Chullin there.
234. ↑ Pnei Yehoshua Chullin there in the opinion of the Rashba there. And see Melechet Shlomo there.
235. ↑ Rav Nachman in Chullin 13b; Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 3:2.
236. ↑ Baraita Chullin there and similar.
237. ↑ Commentary to Torat Kohanim there.
238. ↑ Bechor Shor and Chizkuni Leviticus 1:2.
239. ↑ See Birkei Yosef Orach Chaim Siman 680.
240. ↑ Commentary to Shekalim 1:4, and explanation that the intention of the exposition “man” is to include converts, see Zion 213.
241. ↑ See Zevachim 5a.
242. ↑ Baraita Pesachim 89b and in Tosefta Pesachim 7. And see Tosefta there that the same applies to other offerings.
243. ↑ See Rashi Pesachim there s.v. “the seller”; Meiri there. And see Ketzot HaChoshen Siman 406 Subsection 1.
244. ↑ See Rashi there and Meiri there.
245. ↑ See Leviticus 1:2 and onwards.
246. ↑ Mishnah Menachot 104b; Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Nedavah 3; Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 3:1.
247. ↑ Ramban Leviticus 1:2; Ra’ah there; Gur Aryeh there; Commentary to Torat Kohanim there.
248. ↑ Rambam there, and see Gemara below. And this is apparently when they initially vowed with the intention to bring in partnership, but if two vowed each on their own, they cannot fulfill with one offering, and see Zion 252 and onwards.
249. ↑ Leviticus 1:2. Torat Kohanim there. And see Commentary there, that since it is stated at the beginning of the verse “man” in singular, they expounded from the word “you shall bring” to include the many. And see the explanation of the Riva Leviticus there who wondered why this exposition was needed besides the exposition in Zion 251, and see the explanation of Rabbi Chaim Paltiel there and Dober Meisharim Maaseh HaKorbanot 14:2.
250. ↑ See Menachot there and Torat Kohanim below.

251. ↑ Leviticus 22:19. Gemara Menachot there; Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah Chapter 8. And see there and there, that this also includes the burnt offering of a bird and other sacrifices besides the meal offering.
252. ↑ See Minchat Yehuda (Eilenburg) Leviticus there; O.Z. Siman 505 Se'if Katan 4; Macha'shevet Shalom there Se'if Katan 2.
253. ↑ Siftei Chachamim Leviticus 1:2. And see Torah Temimah Leviticus 2:1 in the notes where he wrote the reason that each of them requires atonement with a complete offering.
254. ↑ See Tziyon 31.
255. ↑ See Leviticus 1:2 and onwards.
256. ↑ Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah Chapter 3; see also Moterot and see Kitz HaMizbeach. And see Rif Berachot 21a (13a) that the community does not bring a voluntary burnt offering, and similarly in Rambam Tefillah Chapter 1 Halacha 10, and see HaMaor and the objections of Raavad and Tary on the Rif there and Raavad and Ramach on the Rambam there who were puzzled, and see Milchamot and the method of Ribav and Meiri and Rabbeinu Manoach below and Beit Yosef and Bach Orach Chaim Siman 107 and Ma'ayot Berachot Chapter 3 Siman 15 letter Tzadi, and see Rach Berachot there.
257. ↑ Leviticus 1:2. Torat Kohanim there.
258. ↑ Leviticus there.
259. ↑ R"Sh below.
260. ↑ Torat Kohanim there and R"Sh there in his explanation. And see Raavad and K"A there who explained differently, and it needs clarification according to them if for this teaching the community does not volunteer a burnt offering.
261. ↑ See Moterot.
262. ↑ Rashi Leviticus there, and see Kitz HaMizbeach.
263. ↑ Ramban Leviticus 1:3.
264. ↑ See Lev Beit Din Metaneh: in Kodashim. Ramban below.
265. ↑ Milchamot below.
266. ↑ Ramban there in the opinion of Rashi there, and in Milchamot Berachot there in the opinion of the Rif there. And see Ra'am and Go'a there. And see the method of Ribav there (12b) in the name of the sage Rabbi Natan: that the community does not initially separate a voluntary burnt offering, and similarly in Meiri there, and in Kesef Mishneh Tefillah there in the name of Rabbeinu Manoach, and it needs clarification if their intention is that even as a partner's burnt offering they cannot, and see Tosafot HaRosh Berachot there and Chidushei Anshei Shem there.
267. ↑ Ha'amek Davar Leviticus there, in the opinion of the Rif there. And see there that since the burnt offering is effective for the acceptance of prayers, the community gives their offering to someone who will pray for them.
268. ↑ Tziyon 44 and onwards and Tziyon 82 and onwards.
269. ↑ See Mishnah Me'ilah 9:1; see Torat Kohanim below.
270. ↑ See Rashi there 8a s.v. Chattat and Tosafot there s.v. Mo'alin.
271. ↑ Leviticus 1:2.

272. ↑ Rabbi Yehuda in Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah Chapter 2, and see R"Sh there, and see K"A there that even Rabbi Shimon in Torat Kohanim does not disagree.
273. ↑ See Pesachim 66b, and see Tosafot there s.v. Mevi'ah, and see Chulin SheNishchatu Ba'azara Tziyon 187 and onwards, and see the aforementioned Tziyon 190 that there are those who hold that one should not bring Chulin to the Azarah and Hillel did not bring it while it was Chulin except to the entrance of the Azarah.
274. ↑ R"Sh there, and see Pesachim there. And see Temurah 2a, that the laying on of hands is called "the end of consecration".
275. ↑ See below.
276. ↑ See Chullin 41b.
277. ↑ See Rashi Chullin 139, s.v. Neder.
278. ↑ See Mishnah Menachot 92a; see Torat Kohanim below; see Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot 3:6.
279. ↑ Leviticus 1:4.
280. ↑ 101 to Torat Kohanim below.
281. ↑ Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah 4. And see R"Sh there that it might be an Asmachta, and the main is as the Baraita's exposition below.
282. ↑ Leviticus 9:16.
283. ↑ Rashi Beitzah 20a, s.v. Veya'aseh.
284. ↑ Baraita Beitzah 20a, and parallels. And see Rashi there s.v. Vayikrav, and Tosafot there s.v. Vayikrav and onwards, and Moshe Zekenim Vayikra there, and Pnei Yehoshua Beitzah there.
285. ↑ Leviticus there 10.
286. ↑ See also V (Derasha) note 38 and onwards.
287. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim 48a, s.v. Elyon.
288. ↑ See Tosafot Zevachim there s.v. Ashkachan.
289. ↑ Note 77.
290. ↑ Note 163 and onwards.
291. ↑ See Mishnah Menachot 92a; see Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot 3:10.
292. ↑ See Gemara and Rambam below.
293. ↑ See Gemara Menachot there and Rambam there. On the people's burnt offering of the eighth for the inauguration, if there was Semicha, see Rishonim and Acharonim in note 284, and see also Miluim.
294. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 53b
295. ↑ See Mishnah there 47a, and see also Kodshei Kodashim and see Shechita (Kodashim); see Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot 5:2.
296. ↑ Leviticus 1:11. Zevachim 48a; see Rambam there 5:3.
297. ↑ Leviticus there 10.
298. ↑ See also V (Derasha) note 38 and onwards.
299. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there s.v. Elyon.
300. ↑ Zevachim there.
301. ↑ Leviticus 6:18.
302. ↑ Raavad to Torat Kohanim below; Malbim Tzav letter Nun Vav.

303. ↑ Rabbi Eliezer in Torat Kohanim Tzav section 4. And see Rabbi Chaim Paltiel Leviticus there the reason not to learn north in obligatory burnt offering from the derivations learned from them leaning, see citation 281 and onwards.
304. ↑ See also Sin offering citation 180.
305. ↑ R"Sh and Raavad and K"A to Torat Kohanim there.
306. ↑ Leviticus 7:2.
307. ↑ Rabbi Eliezer in Torat Kohanim Tzav section 5. And see R"Sh and Raavad to Torat Kohanim there, that since we have already learned north in individual burnt offerings, the scripture was only necessary for communal burnt offerings.
308. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 53b.
309. ↑ See also Holy of Holies and see Kabbalah (service); see Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 5:2.
310. ↑ See words of Rabbi Ahiya in Zevachim 48a and Menachot 56a and Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah section 5 (and there: Rabbi Chiya); see Rambam Commentary on the Mishnah Pesachim 1:9. And see Tosafot Zevachim there s.v. Kabbalah who wondered from where they learned in burnt offering for the receiver that it requires north, and see Ra'avad there who wondered why Tosafot did not question from where they learned about the reception itself in burnt offering that it requires north, and see Keren Orah and Shev Shmateta there, and see Kesef Mishneh Maaseh HaKorbanot there 3 and Keren Sadeh there, and see conclusion of the Gemara in Menachot there that the scripture stated in burnt offering is what includes that the receiver requires north, and see Rashi Menachot there s.v. Rabbi, and Shev Shmateta there, and see Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot there 3, that the place of slaughter is the place of reception, and M' who holds that it is the source of the law that reception is in the north, and see Kesef Mishneh there who wondered, and see Radbaz there who explained differently, and needs clarification. And see below.
311. ↑ Leviticus 4:24-25.
312. ↑ See Zevachim there, and see also Sin offering citation 405 and onwards.
313. ↑ Shev Shmateta Zevachim 48b from Mahar"af. And see Rabbeinu Hillel and Raavad to Torat Kohanim there who say that they explain that the law of reception and receiver in the north in burnt offering are learned from sin offering, and it is possible that they also intend this.
314. ↑ Leviticus 1:5.
315. ↑ See citation 300.
316. ↑ See Zevachim 4a, and elsewhere.
317. ↑ Shev Shmateta there from Mahar"af in the name of my teacher.
318. ↑ Citation 163 and onwards.
319. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 53b; see Torat Kohanim below; Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 5:6. And see citation 335. And see Tosefta Zevachim 6 and in the versions there.
320. ↑ Leviticus 1:5.
321. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there s.v. Talmud Lomar.

322. ↑ Baraita in Zevachim there and in Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedavah section 4.
323. ↑ Rashi there s.v. Shtayim.
324. ↑ Shmuel in Zevachim there, and see in Baraita in Zevachim there and in variant readings.
325. ↑ Rashi there s.v. Kemin.
326. ↑ Rashi there.
327. ↑ Rashi there s.v. "and its blood". And see Torat Kohanim there, that according to the first Tanna, the implication of "and they shall sprinkle etc. around" is that the sprinkling should be surrounding, meaning a sprinkling divided into two directions. And see Meromei Sadeh, that even Rabbi Yishmael below, who disagrees on the definition of two gifts that are four, agrees regarding the communal burnt offering that it is done with two gifts in the form of a gamma, as in the Mishnah Tamid 2b, and his proof from there needs clarification.
328. ↑ Leviticus there.
329. ↑ Leviticus 9:15. See Rashi there s.v. "and it is said". And see Pri Deah Zevachim there that it can be learned from the bull and goat of Yom Kippur, which have four gifts on the four corners of the inner altar, and it is said about them in Leviticus 16:18: "around", and see the commentary of Rabbeinu Hillel to Torat Kohanim there, and see Azarat Kohanim there that this is the case in Torat Kohanim Acharei Mot chapter 4, and see Meromei Sadeh there.
330. ↑ See also sin offering.
331. ↑ Torat Kohanim there, and in the Baraita in the Gemara there: division and four gifts, and some versions: division of four gifts.
332. ↑ See also outer altar.
333. ↑ See citation 360 and onwards. Baraita in the Gemara there.
334. ↑ See Baraita there and there. And it needs clarification in the Tabernacle, which had a foundation on four sides, and also in the First Temple, according to those who hold so, see also outer altar, if according to Rabbi Yishmael the blood application of the burnt offering was on four corners, and see Tosafot Zevachim 61b s.v. "four".
335. ↑ Rav there, and in the Gemara there that this is the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael. And it is explained from the words of Rav that this too is included in "two gifts that are four", and in Torat Kohanim it implies that Rabbi Yishmael disagrees with those who hold that two gifts that are four are given.
336. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there s.v. "gives". And see Torat Kohanim there, that according to Rabbi Yishmael "and they shall sprinkle etc. around" means that they should sprinkle separate sprinklings around on four sides, a sprinkling on each side, or that "around" is only said about the altar, that the sprinkling should be around it.
337. ↑ Rambam there. And see Kesef Mishneh there that even though Rav said to give and return and give, and the law is like him in prohibitions, see also law citation 810, Rav did not know that it is a dispute among Tannaim, and

the law is like the first Tanna. And see also sprinkling citation 133, that there are those who say it is permissible to give also two separate gifts for each corner.

338. ↑ Citation 139 and onwards.
339. ↑ Citation 135 and onwards.
340. ↑ Kinnim 1:1.
341. ↑ Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 5:6.
342. ↑ See also outer altar. See Middot 3:1 and Zevachim 53a; see Rashi Zevachim 10a s.v. “and the rest” and Tosafot Kinnim 22a s.v. “below”; Kesef Mishneh there.
343. ↑ See Leviticus 1:4 and more.
344. ↑ See Leviticus 4:25 and more, and see also blood application.
345. ↑ See Rashi Sotah 32b s.v. “above” and Sanhedrin 4b s.v. “that they gave” and Zevachim 10a s.v. “since” and Niddah 40b s.v. “and those given”.
346. ↑ See also outer altar.
347. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim there.
348. ↑ See citation 360.
349. ↑ See Peirush HaMishnayot of the Rambam Zevachim 6:5; Raavad to Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Chovah chapter 3; see Tosafot Kinnim there; commentary of the Rosh Kinnim there; see Ra’avad Zevachim there and Kinnim there; see Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Chovah chapter 9; see Chiddushei HaGra"z Zevachim 10b and 51a.
350. ↑ See also bird sin offering citation 110a and onwards.
351. ↑ See also Olah Ha’of.
352. ↑ See also Matan Damim.
353. ↑ See Peirush HaMishnayot by Rambam there.
354. ↑ Leviticus 1:5 and more.
355. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim 53b s.v. Ta’leh, and see Malbim Leviticus 1 letter Mem.
356. ↑ Malbim there letter Mem Bet.
357. ↑ Leviticus 6:19.
358. ↑ See Zevachim 10b, where this derivation is needed to exclude the Asham whose blood is not above according to Rabbi Eliezer who holds that there are matters learned from the Chattat. And see Torat Kohanim Tzav Parsha 5, another derivation to exclude the Asham whose blood is not above.
359. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim 64b s.v. Behemah and the explanation of the Rosh Kinnim there. And see Chiddushei HaGRIZ Zevachim 10a.
360. ↑ Zevachim 53b and 57a and elsewhere.
361. ↑ See Zevachim there and there and Rashi there 53b s.v. Shtei (HaRishonah) and s.v. Olah.
362. ↑ Rashi Yoma 15b s.v. Olah and similarly in Zevachim 26a s.v. Al Gabei.
363. ↑ See also Mizbeach HaChitzon.
364. ↑ See Zevachim 53b and Rashi there, and see Ra’avad to Torat Kohanim below. And see Ra’avad there that in this it is included that the gifts of the Olah should be below the red line so that they are close to the foundation, and see citation 349.

365. ↑ Leviticus 4:25.
366. ↑ See Zevachim 51b and Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Chovah Parsha 3.
367. ↑ See Beraita in Zevachim there 1, and in Torat Kohanim there: that the foundation of the altar of the Olah should be, and see Torat Kohanim there Perek 9.
368. ↑ Tosafot Zevachim 51b s.v. Ten in the last explanation, and in Shitah Mekubetzet there 52a from the Riva; Ra'avad to Torat Kohanim there Parsha 3, and in the explanation of Tamid 32b in the name of his teacher Rabbeinu Ephraim. And see Zevachim 57a: to the foundation of the altar of the Olah, taught about the obligatory Olah that requires a foundation, and see Rashi Yoma there, and see Tosafot there in the name of Rabbeinu Baruch, that even though he explains "give a foundation to the altar of the Olah" on the pouring of the remnants, see citation 390, nevertheless his opinion is that the main derivation from "to the foundation of the altar of the Olah" is "the altar of the Olah should be to the foundation" meaning that the initial giving of the blood of the Olah is opposite the foundation, and see citation 392. And see Rashi Zevachim 57a s.v. VeOlah, and see below.
369. ↑ See also Shirayim HaDam.
370. ↑ See also the above.
371. ↑ See also the above.
372. ↑ See also Zerikah citation 66.
373. ↑ See Zevachim 52a and Tosafot and Shitah Mekubetzet there and Ra'avad to Torat Kohanim there. And see Zevachim there, that according to Rabbi Yishmael the remnants are essential but do not come to atone, and they derived a kal vachomer from them to the beginning of the Olah that atones, and according to Rabbi Akiva the remnants are not essential at all and they derived a kal vachomer from them to the beginning of the Olah that is essential, and see there for further explanation in their dispute.
374. ↑ See also the above.
375. ↑ See Ra'avad there. And see Tosafot there in the name of Rabbeinu Baruch that "Mizbeach" is derived for the remnants of the blood, see citation 392, and there in the last explanation and in Shitah Mekubetzet there from the Riva that "Mizbeach" is derived for other offerings that are given below, and according to this it seems the reason that the beginning of the blood of the Olah is not to the foundation itself as in citation 378.
376. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there in the explanation of the Gemara there, and see Rashi Zevachim 57a s.v. Ve'olah. And see Ra'avyah siman 1147, that it is a Tannaitic dispute whether it is learned from a derasha or from a kal vachomer.
377. ↑ See Tziyon 319.
378. ↑ Tosafot there s.v. Gag.
379. ↑ See above.
380. ↑ Tosafot there in the name of Rabbi Chaim.
381. ↑ See Zrikah Tziyon 166.
382. ↑ See Zevachim 53b and Yoma 15b and Meromei Sadeh below.
383. ↑ Leviticus 1:4 and more.

384. ↑ Meromei Sadeh Zevachim 51a. And see Zevachim 56b where they learned with a gezeirah shavah for sacrifices where it is said “and they shall sprinkle” that they require a foundation.
385. ↑ See Tosefta Zevachim chapter 6.
386. ↑ See Mishnah Tamid 32b, regarding the daily burnt offering; see below; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot 5:6.
387. ↑ Leviticus 4:25.
388. ↑ See Zevachim 51b and Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Chovah chapter 3.
389. ↑ See Baraita in Zevachim there 1, and in Torat Kohanim there: that there should be a foundation for the altar of the burnt offering, and see Torat Kohanim there chapter 9.
390. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there 1 s.v. El Yesod (the gloss); Tosafot there 2 s.v. Ten in the name of Rabbi Chaim and Rabbeinu Baruch; Ra’avad Tamid there. And see Tziyon 364 where it is explained “give a foundation to the altar of the burnt offering” in a different manner.
391. ↑ See Tziyon 368.
392. ↑ Tosafot there in the name of Rabbeinu Baruch.
393. ↑ Deuteronomy 12:27.
394. ↑ Baraita in Zevachim 37a. And see Tosafot Zevachim 51b s.v. Ten and in Shitah Mekubetzet there 1 in the opinion of Rashi there and Ra’avad Tamid there, where it is said that it is a dispute of Baraitot from where the pouring of the remnants is derived, and see Ra’avyah siman 1147, and there in Tosafot in the last answer that the pouring of the remnants is not learned from “to the foundation of the altar of the burnt offering,” see Tziyon 364, but from “and the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured” or from “and the remainder of the blood,” and there in the name of Rabbi Chaim and Rabbeinu Baruch that from “and the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured” or from “and the remainder of the blood” it is not learned for a burnt offering that is not eaten but for sacrifices that are eaten.
395. ↑ See Shirayim of the Blood.
396. ↑ Tosafot Zevachim 37a s.v. Matan.
397. ↑ Leviticus 5:9.
398. ↑ See Baraita below.
399. ↑ Baraita in Zevachim there.
400. ↑ See Ra’avad below in the opinion of his teacher, and there what he inclined to explain the distinction.
401. ↑ Ra’avad Tamid there in the name of his teacher, Rabbeinu Ephraim.
402. ↑ See Tziyon 319.
403. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim 37a s.v. Minayin and 51a s.v. El Yesod; R"M of Pontiza, in Tosafot Zevachim 53b s.v. Ha’olah; see Ra’avad Tamid there. And see Meromei Sadeh Zevachim 53b.
404. ↑ See Tosafot there and the glosses of Shitah Mekubetzet manuscript in his words. And see Ra’avad there at the end of the matter. And see Shev Shma’atsa Zevachim there in the Rambam’s opinion there.

405. ↑ See Mishnah Tamid there; Rambam there. And see Ra’avad Tamid there, and there that therefore they said in the Tosefta that it was poured below, because it concludes with the blood application on the southwestern corner and pours the remainder below there.
406. ↑ See also Zrikah Tziyon 139 and onwards. See Ra’avad above.
407. ↑ See Zevachim 53a.
408. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 53b; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot 6:1.
409. ↑ Leviticus 1:6. Zevachim 103b; Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Nedavah 5.
410. ↑ See Ra’avad below.
411. ↑ See Torat Kohanim there that they learned from “Ha’olah” to include the burnt offering of women and gentiles for flaying, and see Ra’avad there that according to this also obligatory burnt offerings and sheep burnt offerings are included in the derashah, and similarly in K"A there, and see R"Sh who holds that obligatory burnt offerings and sheep burnt offerings are learned from cattle burnt offerings by way of “Bameh Matinu,” and see there that he wonders.
412. ↑ Tziyon 72 and onwards.
413. ↑ See also Psulei HaMukdashim.
414. ↑ Tziyon 17.
415. ↑ Tziyon 187.
416. ↑ See Shekalim 6:4 and Rambam Hilchot Beit HaBechirah 2:15, and see below, and see Ra’avad there and K"A and Pnei Moshe Shekalim 6:3.
417. ↑ See also Holachah Tziyon 335 and onwards, and see Tamid, and see below.
418. ↑ See also Holachah Tziyon 455.
419. ↑ Ribav"n Shekalim 17b; Rosh Tamid 31b; see Rashash Shekalim there. And according to this, it seems that even in individual offerings they would not place the limbs on the table unless needed, such as when a single priest offers them.
420. ↑ Ra’avad, cited in Malach HaShamayim Shekalim there.
421. ↑ See below; see Mishnah Tamid 31a, in the daily offering, and it needs clarification why washing is mentioned only in the body and not in the legs; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot 6:6, and it needs clarification as above. On the nature of the legs, see Malach HaShamayim Tamid 4:3.
422. ↑ Leviticus 1:9.
423. ↑ Leviticus there 1:13.
424. ↑ Deuteronomy 23:12.
425. ↑ See Torat Kohanim below and Ra’avad and R"Sh and K"A there in its explanation.
426. ↑ See Avot de-Rabbi Natan Bamidbar 19:7.
427. ↑ Raavad and Kesef Mishneh there.
428. ↑ Torat Kohanim Dibura d’Nedava Chapter 6, and likewise there Chapter 7.
429. ↑ Ramban Vayikra 1:6. And see Tamid 31a, that it is stated that in communal burnt offerings, the one who merited to carry the innards to the ramp would rinse them, and see Raavad there.
430. ↑ Ramban there.

431. ↑ Vayikra there 1:9, and there 1:13: “And the priest shall offer the whole and burn it.”
432. ↑ Ibn Ezra Vayikra there 1:9; see Ramban there.
433. ↑ Ibn Ezra there. And see there 1:6 where he wrote similarly regarding the flaying and cutting.
434. ↑ Ramban below, and see Panim Yafot and Haamek Davar below that this is also the opinion of the Mishnah Yoma 25a.
435. ↑ Vayikra 1:8.
436. ↑ Vayikra there 1:9.
437. ↑ Vayikra there.
438. ↑ Ramban below. And see Haamek Davar below that it is explicitly stated in the scripture Shemot 29:17-18.
439. ↑ Ramban Vayikra 1:6.
440. ↑ See above, and see Panim Yafot below that it is explicitly stated in the burnt offering of the eighth day in Vayikra 9:13-14.
441. ↑ Panim Yafot below, and see there the reason.
442. ↑ See also Holakha Tzion 335 and onwards. And see there that it is possible that there are burnt offerings whose pieces are not initially placed on the ramp.
443. ↑ Panim Yafot Vayikra there 1:9.
444. ↑ See also the flaying and cutting and above Tzion 429.
445. ↑ Haamek Davar Vayikra 8:20.
446. ↑ Baraita in Zevachim 22a; Torat Kohanim Dibura d’Nedava Chapter 6 and there Chapter 7; Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot Chapter 6 Halacha 6.
447. ↑ See also Wine: Undiluted and Diluted, and there Tzion 444 and onwards. Rashi Zevachim there s.v. “and it was taught”. And see R. Yosef Korkos on Rambam there that it is more than the measure of water dilution.
448. ↑ Rambam there. And see R. Yosef Korkos there who discusses whether it is a scriptural decree that only water is valid or if the disqualification of other liquids is due to the degradation of food, see there.
449. ↑ Vayikra 1:9. Zevachim there; Torat Kohanim there and there. And see Kesef Mishneh on Torat Kohanim there that they derived this from the fact that it says “in water” with a patach, meaning known waters, and see Torah Temimah Vayikra there who explains differently.
450. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim there s.v. “other”; R. Shimon and Raavad on Torat Kohanim there Chapter 6. And see Baraita there.
451. ↑ R. Y. Kurkus there.
452. ↑ Baraita in Zevachim there and in Torat Kohanim there and there; Rambam there.
453. ↑ See also Kiyor Tziyon 84, and there Tziyon 85 and onwards Sh.Y.Ch. See Zevachim there.
454. ↑ Baraita in Zevachim there and in Torat Kohanim there and there.
455. ↑ Tosafot Me’ilah 12b s.v. Kol, and similarly Rashbam Bava Batra 79a s.v. Mayim.
456. ↑ See above. Responsa Beit Yitzchak Orach Chaim Siman 26 Ot D and Rashash Bava Batra there.

457. ↑ Torat Kohanim below.
458. ↑ Torat Kohanim, brought in Tosafot Zevachim there s.v. Veha, and it is not before us, and see Rashi there, and see Masoret HaShas there, and see K.A. Dibura D'Nedava Perek 6 Shem that it was so in his version there.
459. ↑ See Gemara below.
460. ↑ Baraita of Beit Shmuel in Zevachim there according to the version of the Talmud before us, and so wrote Ra'avad to Torat Kohanim there, and see Mishneh LaMelech and the glosses of R. Akiva Eiger Ma'aseh HaKorban there who wondered about Rambam who omitted it, and see Tosafot there who said from the words that the invalidation of the water of the Kiyor is not from the Baraita but from the Talmudic discussion, and see below.
461. ↑ See Keren Orah and Sefat Emet Zevachim there, and Aharonim Ma'aseh HaKorban there, in the words of Rambam who did not write to invalidate in this, and explained that the intention of the Gemara there is that the sanctity of the Kiyor is not a reason to learn from it by a fortiori, and nevertheless the water of the Kiyor is learned by a fortiori because they are living waters according to those who hold so, and see K.A. there. And see Orach Shulchan Ma'aseh HaKorban there that it is explicitly in Divrei HaYamim II 6: the work of the burnt offering they shall wash in them.
462. ↑ Leviticus 1:9 and 13. See Targum Yonatan Leviticus there, and see Rashi Exodus 29:13, and see Shekel Tov Genesis 25:22, and see Pri Chadash Yoreh De'ah Siman 64 Se'if Katan 9 that the stomach and the intestines and the abomasum are included in the offering. And see Radak Isaiah 16:11. And see Tziyon 467.
463. ↑ Mishnah Tamid 31a, in the daily burnt offering; Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorban Perek 6 Halacha 6.
464. ↑ See also Lishkot. See R. Sh. below and Ra'avad below; see Rosh Tamid there. See Ra'avad Tamid Perek 4 Mishnah 2.
465. ↑ R. Sh. to Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Nedava Perek 6; Ra'avad Tamid there; see Rosh there. And see Mefaresh Tamid there s.v. Veyadichu. And according to this, the main place of washing is on the tables, like the washing of the intestines, see below, but because of a reason they needed to wash the stomach in the washing house specifically, and see Mefaresh Tamid there s.v. Bemi'ut, who said from his words the opposite, that the main place of washing is in the washing house but since they did not want to wash the intestines with the stomach so as not to soil them, they washed them on the tables.
466. ↑ Ra'avad Tamid there.
467. ↑ See Mefaresh Tamid there s.v. Veyadichu and R. Sh. in Tziyon 470. And see Mishmarot Kehunah Yoma 19a, that even the heart, lung, and liver are included in the washing of the intestines, and it needs clarification, for they were hung with the other pieces, see also Flaying and Dissection.
468. ↑ Tamid there, in the daily burnt offering; Rambam there. And see Shekalim Perek 6 Mishnah 4. And see Mefaresh Tamid there who said that "between the pillars" and according to him the marble tables on which they washed were in the slaughterhouse, and they were high so that it would be

convenient to wash on them, and they are not the tables between the pillars on which they flayed, and see also Slaughterhouse: the tables, and see Lishkot Tziyon 267 and onwards.

469. ↑ R. Sh. there; Rosh Tamid there in explanation 3. And see Mefaresh Tamid there.
470. ↑ R. Sh. there.
471. ↑ Tamid there. R. Sh. and Rosh there, and see Rosh there that according to this the version in the Mishnah is “in the minority of the tables” (and not “on the tables”). And see Tziyon 488.
472. ↑ See Tziyon 481 and Tziyon 488.
473. ↑ R. Sh. and Rosh there in explanation 2 in what we learned in Middot Perek 5 Mishnah 3 that they wash the intestines in the washing chamber. And see Tosafot Yoma 19a s.v. Shesham, that on the tables they wash the other meat and the washing of the intestines is done in the chamber, and seemingly this is besides the daily offering and see Rosh there, and see Rambam Hilchot Beit HaBechirah Perek 5 Halacha 14 and 17, and see Maharsha Yoma there and Tosefot Yom Tov Middot Perek 5 Mishnah 3. And see Merkevet HaMishneh Ma’aseh HaKorban there in the words of Rambam that they washed the intestines from the dung three times in the chamber, see below, and afterwards they washed it again on the tables like the other meat. And see R. Sh. and Rosh there in explanation 1, that the intestines mentioned in Middot there are the stomach, and so it is in Rosh there 32b, and see Piskei Tosafot in Tziyon 478 who said that he explained differently, and so it is in Pnei Moshe Shekalim Perek 6 Halacha 3.
474. ↑ Mishnah Tamid 31a; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorban Perek 6 Halacha 6.
475. ↑ See R. Sh. to Torat Kohanim Dibura D’Nedava Perek 6. And see his words in Tziyon 479, and it seems he holds that the stomach suffices with a thorough washing once and the intestines sometimes need three washings, and so it is written in Piskei Tosafot Middot Ot 23, that the stomach since it is smooth suffices with one washing, and see below.
476. ↑ Explains always there.
477. ↑ Explains always there, and see Ra’avad there.
478. ↑ Mishnah Tamid there. And see Tosafot’s rulings in citation 475, that according to his opinion there, they would wash the innards three times on the tables, see citation 468, besides once when they would wash them in the washing chamber.
479. ↑ See R"Sh there.
480. ↑ See Ra’avad there.
481. ↑ Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot 6:6 and in his commentary on the Mishnah Tamid there; Rosh there in his second explanation; Ra’avad there. And see there that they explained thus the language of the Mishnah: in its minority, and see citation 471 and citation 488.
482. ↑ Ra’avad there.
483. ↑ Rambam’s commentary on the Mishnah there, and see Ra’avad there.
484. ↑ See explainer in citation 476.
485. ↑ See Mishnah Bava Metzia 72b, and more.

486. ↑ Job 21:24. Ra’avad below.
487. ↑ See citation 468.
488. ↑ Tamid 31a. Ra’avad there; see Rosh Tamid there in the name of Y"M.
489. ↑ See citation 471 and citation 481.
490. ↑ See above.
491. ↑ Ra’avad Tamid 31a. And see Rashi and Metzudat David on the verse below that explained that the washing of the burnt offering mentioned there is the washing of the innards. And see Ezekiel 40:38 and Rashi and Radak there.
492. ↑ II Chronicles 4:6.
493. ↑ Ra’avad there in the name of his teacher, and it is brought in Malach HaShabbat Tamid 4:2 with textual variations. And see Tosafot Yoma 19a s.v. “that there.”
494. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 53b; Tosefta Zevachim chapter 11; Rambam Ma’aseh HaKorbanot 6:1. And see Sefer HaMitzvot of Rambam, root 12, which counts in the order of the burnt offering’s actions that its fat is offered and then all its flesh is burned, and it needs clarification, as we do not find in the burnt offering the offering of fat separately and flesh separately, but all is offered as one, and see citation 501 and citation 509.
495. ↑ Leviticus 1:9. Rambam there.
496. ↑ See Leviticus 1:7-9 and there 11-13; see Rambam there 4.
497. ↑ Citation 42.
498. ↑ Citation 297 and onwards.
499. ↑ Citation 1057 and onwards.
500. ↑ See above.
501. ↑ Makd"D Siman He Ot Gimel. And see there that he proved this from the fact that they offer on the altar the parts of the sacrificial portions when they are connected to the limbs that are offered one after the other, see also Haktara Tziyon 33, whereas in other sacrifices the law of the sacrificial portions is to offer them all at once, see the aforementioned Tziyon 81, and see Tziyon 494.
502. ↑ See also Amurim Tziyon 17 and onwards.
503. ↑ See also the aforementioned there.
504. ↑ See also Haktara Tziyon 14 and onwards.
505. ↑ Makd"D there.
506. ↑ See above.
507. ↑ See also Zerika Tziyon 93, and there Tziyon 99. And see there Tziyon 94 and onwards, where Rabbi Eliezer disagrees.
508. ↑ See the various sacrificial values and see Amurim.
509. ↑ See Zevachim 109a and b and elsewhere; Rambam Peirush HaMishnayot Perek 1 Halacha 30.
510. ↑ See also Matanot Kehuna and see Kodshei Kodashim.
511. ↑ See Mishnah Zevachim 103a; Tosefta Zevachim Perek 11; see Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot Perek 5 Halacha 19.
512. ↑ See Tosafot Zevachim there s.v. Hanicha; see Rambam there.

513. ↑ See Gemara Zevachim there where they discussed if the surplus that comes for the altar's maintenance, whose skins are not for the priests, see Tziyon 544, and from the fact that the altar's maintenance that comes from public donation certainly was not diminished, and see Olat Shlomo and Chemdat Daniel and Chiddushei HaGRIZ there.
514. ↑ Leviticus 7:8. Rambam there.
515. ↑ Sifrei Korach 119, and see Tosefta Challah Perek 2, and more.
516. ↑ Bahag Introduction: Skins of Sacrifices; Rasag: Skin of the Burnt Offering; Yireh"Sh Siman 145: Skins of Sacrifices.
517. ↑ Rambam, Sefer Mitzvot Gadol and Chinuch. And see Rambam below.
518. ↑ See Tziyon 60. Sefer HaMitzvot of Rambam Shoresh 12. And see R"Y Perla Introduction Perek 7 who wondered, that general commandments that apply to sacrifices Rambam counts as separate commandments, and since the skins of all the most holy sacrifices have the same law as the skin of the burnt offering, the commandment of giving them to the priest is a general commandment.
519. ↑ R"Y Perla page 113-114, in the words of Ramban in his critiques on Sefer HaMitzvot Shoresh 12. And see there that he wrote in the words of the Geonim that the commandment of giving is imposed on the owners, and he proved like them.
520. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 103a; Baraita there and in Torat Kohanim Tzav Perek 9; Sages in the Tosefta below; Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot Perek 5 Halacha 21.
521. ↑ Baraita there and there and Sages in the Tosefta below; see Rambam there.
522. ↑ Leviticus 7:8.
523. ↑ Leviticus there.
524. ↑ Baraita there, and see Tosefta below.
525. ↑ Tosefta Zevachim Perek 11. And see Tosafot Zevachim there s.v. Ein, on the reason women and slaves were excluded from one verse. And it seems that according to this the skin is given to the owners, and see Tziyon 541 and onwards regarding the skin of a convert's burnt offering who died without heirs for those who hold it is not for the priests, to whom it is given.
526. ↑ See Zevachim there, that the burnt offering of converts that Rabbi Yochanan said its skin is not for the priests, does not refer to the burnt offering of a convert who is still alive, and see the Baraita there and there and there that the burnt offering of converts whose skin is for the priests is derived from "the offering," and see Rashi Zevachim there s.v. "this is," and R. Shimon to Torat Kohanim there in his name, and Kesef Mishneh Maaseh HaKorbanot there in the Rambam's opinion, who do not have the version "converts" in the Baraita, and their reason is because the burnt offering of converts does not need a derivation, see R. Shimon and Kesef Mishneh there, and see citation 536 that there are those who interpret converts as referring to a convert who died without heirs.
527. ↑ Zevachim there.
528. ↑ See citation 214.

529. ↑ Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot Chapter 5 Halacha 21, and see Kesef Mishneh there that this is the Rambam's version in the Baraita Zevachim 103a to include the burnt offering of a non-Jew from "the offering," and it is a correct version, and see Zevach Todah Zevachim there that it is stated from Tosefta Zevachim Chapter 11 that this version is incorrect, see citation 535, and nevertheless, it can be deduced from the language of the Mishnah Zevachim there that whenever the altar merits its flesh, the priests merit its skin, and this includes even the burnt offering of a non-Jew, and see Chok Natan and Pnei Moshe Zevachim there, that the burnt offering of a non-Jew does not need a derivation (and see Chok Natan there, that even in the Rambam one should not read non-Jew). And see citation 516 and onwards, that there are those who say that giving the skin to the priests is a separate commandment imposed on the owners of the sacrifice, and it needs clarification according to this if it applies to a non-Jew.
530. ↑ Leviticus 7:8.
531. ↑ Baraita in Torat Kohanim Tzav Chapter 9 and in Zevachim 103a and in Tosefta Zevachim Chapter 11. And see Shefa Emet Zevachim there that even Rabbi Yehuda who excludes from "the burnt offering of a man" the burnt offering of the sacred may agree with this derivation, and see R. Shimon to Torat Kohanim there that the derivation in Torat Kohanim there and in the Baraita in Zevachim there to include converts deals with a convert while he is alive and does not contradict the words of Rabbi Yochanan in a convert who died without heirs, and see Rashi Zevachim there s.v. "this is" burnt offering and R. Shimon there in his name and Kesef Mishneh Maaseh HaKorbanot Chapter 5 Halacha 21 in the Rambam's opinion who omitted converts from the Baraita, and see Tzafnat Paneach and Chok Natan Zevachim there, and see below.
532. ↑ Ravina in Zevachim there in the explanation of the Baraita there.
533. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim there s.v. "and not."
534. ↑ Leviticus there.
535. ↑ See Tosefta Zevachim Chapter 11 and Torat Kohanim there and Baraita in Zevachim there.
536. ↑ See Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot Chapter 5 who omitted the law of a convert who died without heirs, and see Likutei Halachot and Zevach Todah Zevachim there s.v. "not excluded in his opinion," that the derivation in Torat Kohanim and in the Baraita in Zevachim there to include converts deals with a convert who died without heirs, and not like Rabbi Yochanan, and so it is stated in the Tosefta there; Raavad to Torat Kohanim there; Beit HaZevach Zevachim there; Chasdei David to Tosefta there.
537. ↑ Raavad there. And see Chasdei David there who wrote the reason because the one who brings the burnt offering of a convert who died merits it (for the atonement of the community, as an heir, see there) and again it is "the burnt offering of a man," and it needs clarification, because it seems that if another merited it, they did not disagree and its law is like the burnt offering of one who died and has heirs whose skin is certainly for the priests, see Shefa Emet Zevachim there.

538. ↑ See Baraita there and there, and Chok Natan there and Likutei Halachot and Zevach Todah there in the Rambam's opinion.
539. ↑ See Rambam there.
540. ↑ See above.
541. ↑ Rosh Hashanah to Torat Kohanim there.
542. ↑ Raavad to Torat Kohanim there. And see Shefa Emet Zevachim there who wondered, that if the convert separated the libations of his burnt offering while alive, what will be done with its skin, and see Shekalim Chapter 7 Mishnah 6. And see Shefa Emet there who inclined that the skin is ownerless or the sacred merited it by acquisition of the courtyard. And see Rashi Temurah 23b s.v. "that there is not," according to what Rabbi Yehuda initially thought that a burnt offering that comes from the surplus its skin is not for the priests, that they sell it and buy animals for the summer of the altar.
543. ↑ See there Surplus. See Gemara below.
544. ↑ See Zevachim 103a, that Rabbi Yehuda who said in the Baraita there that its skin is not for the priests retracted regarding Rabbi Nehemiah or Rabbi Shimon who says its skin is for the priests, and also Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef and Rav Nachman in the name of Rabba bar Avuha, who explained in the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda in the Baraita there (and in Torat Kohanim Tzav Chapter 9 and in Tosefta Zevachim Chapter 11) that the burnt offering of the sacred its skin is not for the priests, that his intention is for a burnt offering that comes from the surplus, it is stated that their words were rejected in favor of the words of Rav Hamnuna that Rabbi Yehuda retracted in a burnt offering that comes from the surplus and admitted that its skin is for the priests, and see Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot Chapter 5 Halacha 21 and Rabbi Yosef Korkos there.
545. ↑ See Zevachim there.
546. ↑ Leviticus 5:19.
547. ↑ See there Eating of Sacrifices citation 19 and onwards.
548. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim there s.v. "this is" six, and Raavad Shekalim Chapter 6 Mishnah 6. And see Raavad to Torat Kohanim below who explained in another way.
549. ↑ Mishnah Shekalim there and Torat Kohanim Dibura D'Chovah Chapter 21, and see Zevachim there.
550. ↑ Kings II 12:17. Mishnah there and Torat Kohanim there.
551. ↑ Ra'avad there.
552. ↑ Tziyon 263 and onwards.
553. ↑ Mishnah Zevachim 43:3.
554. ↑ See Rashi below.
555. ↑ Leviticus 7:8.
556. ↑ See Rashi there s.v. "and its skin" and the gloss of Shitah Mekubetzet there in his words, and see Ra'avad Zevachim 4:4.
557. ↑ See also "Thought in Sacrifices."

558. ↑ See Mishnah Zevachim 103:1; Tosefta Zevachim Chapter 11; see Baraita in Zevachim there and in Torat Kohanim Tzav Chapter 9; see Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 5:19 and Pesulei HaMukdashin 19:9. And see Rambam Pesulei HaMukdashin there that even when the sacrifice is invalidated by the thought of pigul after it was skinned, the skin is not for the priests, and see Zevach Todah Zevachim 103b s.v. “Rabbi.” And see Gemara Zevachim there that they explained the aforementioned Mishnah when the meat was invalidated, and see Shev Shma’atsa there and Keren Orah there 104a and Zevach Todah there s.v. “Who.”
559. ↑ Leviticus 7:8.
560. ↑ Mishnah there; see Tosefta there; Baraita in Gemara and in Torat Kohanim there. And see Melechet Shlomo Zevachim Chapter 12 Mishnah 2, that it is said: an offering that ascended to the fires, meaning it is fit for offering on the altar.
561. ↑ Baraita in Gemara there and in Torat Kohanim there.
562. ↑ See also above.
563. ↑ Mishnah there; Baraita in Zevachim there and in Torat Kohanim there; Rambam Pesulei HaMukdashin there.
564. ↑ Leviticus there.
565. ↑ Baraita there and there.
566. ↑ Commentary on the Mishnah by Rambam Zevachim there.
567. ↑ See also “Yotzei” and see “Linah.” See Tosefta below.
568. ↑ Tosefta Zevachim Chapter 11. And see Likutei Halachot Zevachim 104a.
569. ↑ See Keren Orah Zevachim 104a, and there he wondered why they did not explain there in Gemara 103b that this is the intention of the Mishnah there that as long as the altar did not merit its meat, the priests did not merit its skin, and see Zevach Todah there.
570. ↑ See also “Blood of Sacrifices: in Purity and Impurity.”
571. ↑ See Gemara in explanation of the Mishnah below.
572. ↑ See Tosefta below.
573. ↑ See Baraita and Tosefta below.
574. ↑ See Baraita in Zevachim 104a and Gemara there 103b in its explanation, and there the words of Abaye that the Mishnah there 103b that sacrifices that became invalid before their skinning, their skins are not for the priests, is according to Rabbi; Tosefta Zevachim Chapter 11, and see Chasdei David there in correcting the text. And see Zevach Todah Zevachim there, who tended to explain the reason according to Rabbi, that since they do not offer except after skinning, all that the meat was invalidated before it was skinned, it is as if the altar did not yet merit the meat and therefore the priests did not merit the skin, and see Chiddushei HaGri"z there 103b s.v. “Rabbi,” and needs further study.
575. ↑ See Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot 5:20 and Pesulei HaMukdashin 19:9.
576. ↑ See Gemara in explanation of the Mishnah below.
577. ↑ See Tosefta below. And see Chasdei David there and Keren Orah Zevachim 104a, that a disqualified overnight is not relevant in this law, because since the meat stayed overnight before the sprinkling, the blood

also stayed overnight, and according to everyone, the skin is not for the priests, see citation 568.

578. ↑ See also sprinkling citation 94 and onwards.
579. ↑ See Zevachim 104a.
580. ↑ See also the aforementioned citation 90.
581. ↑ A Baraita in Zevachim there and Gemara there in its explanation, and see the words of Rava there 103b that the Mishnah there a, that if the altar did not merit the meat, the priests did not merit the skin, is according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzadak, and also the Mishnah there b, that sacrifices that became disqualified before flaying, their skins are not for the priests, is according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzadak, and before flaying means before the meat is seen for flaying, meaning before sprinkling; Tosefta Zevachim chapter 11.
582. ↑ See also the aforementioned citation 100 and see Yotzei citation 684.
583. ↑ See also sprinkling citation 92.
584. ↑ Rashi Zevachim there s.v. but in the explanation of the Gemara there.
585. ↑ Tosafot Zevachim there s.v. who. And see Aharon HaZaken Maaseh HaKorbanot chapter 5 halacha 19, that this is the opinion of the Rambam who did not mention the permission of the skin in a disqualified sacrifice because the meat was lost even though the law is according to Rabbi, but the reason of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzadak according to him is not because of a decree, but it is a law regarding the skin that the priests do not merit it as long as the altar did not merit the meat, see Mishnah Zevachim 103a, and nevertheless this law is only relevant to the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua that if there is no meat there is no blood, which means that the sacrifice requires the appeasement of the blood on the meat, but according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer that there is blood without meat, since the sacrifice does not require the appeasement of blood on the meat, there is no reason to say that the permission of the skin depends on the permission of the meat.
586. ↑ See Kesef Mishneh on the Laws of Sacrifices chapter 19 halacha 9 that explains the words of the Rambam there, and see Har HaMoriah there and Shev Shemaatsa Zevachim 104a, and see Likutei Halachot and Zevach Todah Zevachim there in the opinion of the Rambam Maaseh HaKorbanot chapter 5 halacha 20; Chasdei David on the Tosefta there.
587. ↑ See citation 609 and onwards.
588. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim 86a s.v. to do. And see Chiddushei HaGri"z there 103b s.v. Rabbi, who wondered, since the meat of the burnt offering is not for the priests, why should the priests merit the bones, and see there that he discusses regarding horns and hooves, and see Kesef Mishneh Shofar chapter 1 halacha 3, and see Chiddushei HaGri"z Temurah 23b who says that he holds that the bones are not for the priests.
589. ↑ Mishnah Me’ilah 9:1; Rambam Me’ilah chapter 2 halacha 3.
590. ↑ See Rashi Me’ilah 8a s.v. sin offering, and see Malach Shlomo Me’ilah chapter 2 Mishnah 2, and see Tosefot Yom Tov there Mishnah 1.
591. ↑ See also Me’ilah and see Holy of Holies.

592. ↑ See Rashi there.
593. ↑ See Mishnah Me’ilah 7:2.
594. ↑ Tosafot Me’ilah 8a s.v. there is no misuse with skins.
595. ↑ Mishnah there 9:1; see Rambam there.
596. ↑ See citation 494.
597. ↑ See Rashi Me’ilah there s.v. there is no misuse with it, in the burnt offering of a bird. And see also a thing whose commandment was done citation 1 and see Me’ilah, that a thing whose commandment was done there is no misuse. And see Tosafot Me’ilah 10a s.v. all and Shitah Mekubetzet there 9a s.v. and Rabbi, that even according to those who hold that there is misuse with the ashes on the apple until the time of removal of the ashes, see below, it is because it is not yet considered that its commandment was done.
598. ↑ Citation 47 and onwards.
599. ↑ Mishnah Me’ilah 9:1. And see Zera Avraham siman 17 (Mordechai Zemba) letter 24, who wondered why the Rambam omitted this law, and see Divrei Avraham part 1 in the framework of gold (at the end of the book) to siman 15 letter 5 s.v. and mainly.
600. ↑ See above: the law of its skin. Rashi there s.v. and there is no misuse.
601. ↑ Tosafot Me’ilah 8a s.v. vehakohanim.
602. ↑ See Tziyon 553 and onwards.
603. ↑ See Rashi Zevachim 103b s.v. mani; see Ra’avad Me’ilah 6:2; see Tosafot Me’ilah there s.v. ein and s.v. vehakohanim, and the correction of the Tzafnat Paneach in their words; Meromei Sadeh Chullin 117a and Chiddushei HaGra"ch (Mishor) and Chiddushei HaGri"z Zevachim 103a; Devar Avraham there, and there Shekhem in the Mishnah there and in Rambam Me’ilah 2:2-3, and see there in the gloss. And see Takanat Ezra to Rambam Me’ilah 2:2.
604. ↑ See Zera Avraham Siman 17 (Maram Zemba) Sif-Katan 24, in the words of Tosafot Yoma 59b s.v. hu and Chullin 117a s.v. hu, and see Dvar Avraham there.
605. ↑ See also Haktarah Tziyon 11 and onwards.
606. ↑ Gemara Zevachim 86a in the explanation of the Baraita there according to Rabba (and all the more so according to those who disagree, see there) according to the manuscript of Munich and others, and so it is proven from Rabba’s own words there, that the sprinkling permits them and before that they are forbidden.
607. ↑ Gemara there in the explanation of the Baraita according to Rabba; Rambam Me’ilah 2:12.
608. ↑ See Rashi s.v. lo shanu in the explanation of Rabba’s words.
609. ↑ Rabba in Zevachim there.
610. ↑ Rashi there s.v. aval. And according to this, seemingly, for the Tannaim who hold that they are offered, see Tziyon 619, this is also if they were separated before sprinkling, and consequently there is Me’ilah in them, and see below.
611. ↑ Rabba there.

612. ↑ See also Zerikah Tziyon 83. Rashi there s.v. aval and s.v. lema'avad. And see Rashi there that the sprinkling permits them to the priests, and see Tziyon 588.
613. ↑ Leviticus 7:8.
614. ↑ Leviticus there 7.
615. ↑ See also Me'ilah, and see Rashi Zevachim there and Tosafot there s.v. mah asham, who disagree on the source of the permission.
616. ↑ Zevachim there. See Menachot 83a, where they derived this by analogy, and see Tosafot there s.v. mah asham.
617. ↑ Gemara Zevachim there in the explanation of the Baraita there according to Rabba, and see Rabba's words there; Rambam there.
618. ↑ Rashi there s.v. lo shanu. And see also Me'ilah, in invalid sacrifices if there is Me'ilah in them, and see Aha'az Me'ilah there, and see Tziyon 621 and Tziyon 634.
619. ↑ See also Haktarah Tziyon 17 and onwards.
620. ↑ See Rashi manuscript in Shitah Mekubetzet Zevachim there, and Tosafot there s.v. lo shanu, and Bach and Beit Yosef and Chok Natan and Panim Me'irot there in the explanation of their version. And see Yalkut Shimoni Leviticus Temeh.
621. ↑ Gemara there in the explanation of the Baraita there according to Rabba, according to the aforementioned Rishonim. And it is difficult according to the aforementioned Rishonim, for the Tannaim who hold that if they were separated they are not offered, and this is even if they were separated after sprinkling, whether there is Me'ilah in them, and see Keren Orah Zevachim there that they are not enjoyed and not misappropriated (and according to this the aforementioned Baraita was stated specifically according to the opinion that if they were separated they are offered), and see Tziyon 618.
622. ↑ Rabba there, according to the aforementioned Rishonim.
623. ↑ Gemara there in the explanation of the Baraita according to the aforementioned Rishonim. And see Keren Orah there that explains the reason, that they learned from the teaching of Rabbi Yochanan in the name of Rabbi Yishmael that the bones are permitted, and this is through the sprinkling that permits them, and consequently they are no longer offered, but if they are attached at the time of sprinkling it is impossible for the sprinkling to permit them, for they must still be offered.
624. ↑ See Zevachim there according to Rashi's version there s.v. pirshu lifnei, and Rashi there in the explanation of Rabbi Elazar's opinion. And see Keren Orah there, that according to this the Baraita that states there is Me'ilah in them forever refers to when they were separated before sprinkling.
625. ↑ Rashi there.
626. ↑ R. Elazar in Zevachim there. And seemingly this is according to the Tannaim who hold that after they have been separated, they are not offered, but according to those who hold that they are offered, there is misuse whether they were separated before sprinkling or after sprinkling, and see citation 610, and see Tosafot there s.v. "Ve'pliga," who deliberated in the words of R. Elazar that those who hold that they are separated and offered,

this is when they were separated before sprinkling, but if they were separated after sprinkling, no (contrary to the words of Rabbah according to their opinion, see citation 620), and therefore there is no misuse, and seemingly they wrote this according to Rashi's version mentioned above, for according to the version of some books brought there, see citation 632, on the contrary, if they were separated before sprinkling, they benefit from them, and see Shitah Mekubetzet there in Tosafot s.v. "Ve'pliga" in the name of Tosafot HaRosh, and see Keren Orah there.

627. ↑ See citation 616. Rashi there s.v. "Separated after."
628. ↑ See also sprinkling citation 75. Rashi there.
629. ↑ Rashi there. And it needs clarification if the permission at the time of sprinkling applies to the time they are separated and not fit for offering, or even when they are attached and standing for offering, they are permitted because their offering is not a separate law but in conjunction with the meat they are attached to. And see Merkevet HaMishneh Me'ilah there who wrote the reason, that since the sprinkling prepared them for offering, it follows that once they are separated and not fit for offering, the misuse is removed from them, and it needs clarification.
630. ↑ R. Elazar there.
631. ↑ Rashi there.
632. ↑ Tosafot there s.v. "Ve'pliga," in the version of some books.
633. ↑ Tosafot there, that R. Elazar agrees with Rabbah if they were separated before sprinkling, and this is proven from their version, for the distinction between being separated before sprinkling and after sprinkling is that after sprinkling there is no benefit, whereas before sprinkling there is benefit.
634. ↑ Tosafot there. And see Keren Orah there, that according to this, R. Elazar disagrees with the Baraita, as they explained there according to Rabbah, see citation 607 (and it needs clarification), but from Rabbah's own words there is no proof that his opinion is not like R. Elazar, and there, that R. Elazar's words are for those who hold that once separated, they are not offered, but for those who hold that they are offered, there is misuse, and if so, it is possible that the Baraita was stated according to those who hold that they are offered and R. Elazar does not disagree with it. And see Keren Orah there, who stated the reason there is no misuse because they are invalid sanctities, not standing for offering, and not included in the sanctities of God, and see citation 618.
635. ↑ Keren Orah there: It seems, in the explanation of the Baraita there according to R. Elazar.
636. ↑ Keren Orah there according to R. Elazar.
637. ↑ Rambam there. And see Zevach Todah Zevachim there the reason. And seemingly this is according to Rashi's opinion in citation 610, but according to the version in citation 620 that Rabbah's words were stated according to those who hold that once separated, they are offered, which is not the halacha like them, see also offering citation 21 and onwards, it can be said that the halacha is that they are not offered, even if separated after sprinkling there is no misuse, and see citation 621. And see Keren Orah

there, that Rambam did not explain if separated before sprinkling if it is permitted to benefit from them and even to make a handle for a knife from them.

638. ↑ See Tosefta Me'ilah chapter 1 and Mishnah Nazir 24a and Baraita there b and others; Rambam Me'ilah chapter 2 halacha 1.
639. ↑ Rambam there.
640. ↑ See Sifrei Re'eh 74; see Baraita in Makkot 17a and b and others; see Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot chapter 11 halacha 1 and in Sefer HaMitzvot negative commandment 146; Sefer Mitzvot Gadol negative commandment 321; Sefer HaChinuch commandment 447. And see Gemara Makkot there and Rashi there s.v. "Ela," that there is a refutation to R. Shimon's derivation, and see Ritva there that R. Shimon's words are corrupted, and it needs clarification why the aforementioned Rishonim ruled according to his words, and see citation 653.
641. ↑ Deuteronomy 12:17.
642. ↑ R. Shimon in the Baraita there, and see Rambam there.
643. ↑ See Ritva Makkot there.
644. ↑ See Baraita there, and see also Eating of Second Tithe: Place of Eating, and see Prohibitions of Eating citation 26.
645. ↑ See Baraita there and see Prohibitions of Eating citation 48 and see Eating of Sacrifices citation 89.
646. ↑ Rashi Makkot there s.v. "If to eat."
647. ↑ See Baraita there and see Prohibitions of Eating citation 48 and see Firstborn of Pure Animal citation 172.
648. ↑ See Baraita there and see Prohibitions of Eating citation 48 and see Eating of Sacrifices citation 151.
649. ↑ Rashi there.
650. ↑ See citation 663. Rashi Makkot there 2 s.v. "To eat."
651. ↑ R"Sh in the Baraita there.
652. ↑ Sefer HaMitzvot there.
653. ↑ Yir'eh Sh' Siman 82. And see Tziyun 640.
654. ↑ See above.
655. ↑ See Makkot there and Rashi there 2 s.v. Isura and there 18a s.v. Hachi. And see there that even though R"Sh said there that he receives lashes, his intention is only that he transgresses a prohibition.
656. ↑ Tosafot Makkot there 2 s.v. Isura in the name of Mashiach, and there in the name of R"Y; Rambam there and in Sefer HaMitzvot there.
657. ↑ Mashiach in Tosafot there.
658. ↑ See Deuteronomy 12:6 and onwards.
659. ↑ See Makkot 18a.
660. ↑ R"Y in Tosafot there.
661. ↑ Marganita Tava Shoresh 2 in the words of the Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot there who wrote that from tradition they learned from the scripture a warning for eating the flesh of an Olah offering.
662. ↑ Leviticus 1:8-9.
663. ↑ Rashi Makkot 17b s.v. Le'ochal.

664. ↑ Leviticus there 9.
665. ↑ Ritva Makkot 17a.
666. ↑ See Tziyun 651.
667. ↑ Sefer HaMitzvot to Rambam Negative Commandment 146; Sefer Mitzvot Gadol Negative Commandment 321; Sefer HaChinuch Commandment 447.
668. ↑ See Tziyun 663.
669. ↑ See Radbaz below,
670. ↑ See Tziyun 60. Radbaz Ma'aseh HaKorbanot Chapter 11 Halacha 1.
671. ↑ See above.
672. ↑ Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot Chapter 11 Halacha 2, based on Mishnah Me'ilah 15b. And see Peirush HaMishnayot to Rambam Me'ilah Chapter 4 Mishnah 2, who explained the Mishnah regarding other prohibitions. And see Maggid Mishneh Me'ilah Chapter 1 Halacha 3, according to the Rambam there that the prohibition "You shall not be able to eat your vows" is a warning for Me'ilah, the measure for lashes for this prohibition when eating the flesh of an Olah is a full meal and not an olive's bulk, and the measure of an olive's bulk in eating an Olah is said on the prohibition "It shall be wholly burnt, you shall not eat," see Tziyun 677, and see Minchat Chinuch Commandment 447 who wondered, that the wine of libations which is not for the fire is not related to the prohibition "It shall be wholly burnt, you shall not eat" and how it combines to obligate lashes with an olive's bulk. And see Chiddushei HaGriz Zevachim 109a, who wondered that there is no special name for the libations of an Olah different from the libations of other offerings and why the eating of the libations of an Olah is related to the prohibition of eating an Olah.
673. ↑ See above.
674. ↑ See Gemara Makkot below.
675. ↑ See Menachot 74b and Rambam Ma'aseh HaKorbanot Chapter 11 Halacha 3. And see Ra'avan in Responsa Siman 32, who wrote that it is a prohibition in an Olah, and they learned it in Torat Kohanim by a verbal analogy from the meal offering of the priests to what is said in an Olah "It shall be wholly burnt," and it needs clarification, that the scripture "It shall be wholly burnt" is not said in an Olah, and see Torat Kohanim below and Menachot there 1.
676. ↑ Leviticus 6:16.
677. ↑ Braitah Makkot 18b and elsewhere; Torat Kohanim Tzav Chapter 5; Gemara there, and see Ritva there and Riaz in the Kuntres HaRayot there who disagreed in its explanation, and in any case according to both of them there are two prohibitions for eating the flesh of an olah; Ramban in his critiques on Sefer HaMitzvot Shoresh 9; Kesef Mishneh Maaseh HaKorbanot there in the name of "I found written." And see Torat Kohanim there which states that it is a Tannaitic dispute whether the prohibition "it shall be wholly burnt, it shall not be eaten" applies to all offerings or only to the meal offering of priests, and see Tosafot Menachot there 1 s.v. "prohibition"

and Yashar VeTov Menachot there and Chazon Ish Karetot page 172 section 11 in their opinion, that even in the meal offering of priests it is a Tannaitic dispute whether one who eats it transgresses a prohibition.

678. ↑ Radbaz Maaseh HaKorbanot there. And it needs clarification, for in the Gemara Makkot there it is explicit that one who eats from the flesh of an olah before sprinkling transgresses both.
679. ↑ See citation 609 and onwards.
680. ↑ Magen David Siman 23 section 3.
681. ↑ Citation 469 and onwards. And see Acharonim in Sefer HaMafteach (Frenkel) Maaseh HaKorbanot there 5, for those who hold that one is flogged both for the prohibition "you shall not be able to eat your vows" and for the prohibition "it shall be wholly burnt, it shall not be eaten," whether one who eats from the flesh of an olah is flogged twice.
682. ↑ See the words of Rava in Makkot 17b, and Rashi there s.v. "zar."
683. ↑ Citation 151.
684. ↑ See the words of Rava there and Rashi there.
685. ↑ Citation 89.
686. ↑ See the words of Rava there and Rashi there.
687. ↑ Citation 211 and onwards.
688. ↑ See the words of Rava there and Rashi there.
689. ↑ Citation 151.
690. ↑ Exodus 22:30.
691. ↑ See also "Yotze" (in sacrifices) citation 116.
692. ↑ Makkot 18a. And see also the aforementioned citation 130 and onwards.
693. ↑ Exodus 29:33.
694. ↑ See also "Zar" citation 176.
695. ↑ Makkot 18a. And see Tosafot there s.v. "and let him be flogged for being a zar," that some have the version of the Gemara's words on the prohibition, in Leviticus 22:10, "and no zar shall eat holy things," and see also the aforementioned there. And see also the aforementioned citation 184.
696. ↑ Exodus 29:34.
697. ↑ See also "Prohibitions of Eating" citation 34 and see "Disqualified Sacrifices." And see also "Prohibitions of Eating" there that some learned this prohibition from the verse in Deuteronomy 14:3, "you shall not eat any abomination."
698. ↑ Makkot 18b. And see Aruch LaNer there 1, who discusses those who hold that the prohibition is learned from the verse "you shall not eat any abomination," see above, whether it applies to an olah that was disqualified.
699. ↑ Citation 159 and onwards.
700. ↑ Citation 128 and onwards.
701. ↑ Note 91 and onwards.

---

https://www.yeshiva.org.il/wiki/index.php/%D7%90%D7%A0%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%93%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%AA%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%93%D7%99%D7%AA:%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%94